

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>O</sup> LXXVIII. JANUARY 1895.

ART. I.—THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND THE  
PAPAL CLAIMS.

*The Primitive Church and the See of Peter.* By the Rev.  
LUKE RIVINGTON, M.A. With an Introduction by the  
Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. (London, 1894.)

PART II.

WE return to the consideration<sup>1</sup> of Mr. Rivington's enterprise with his entrance on the fifth century, when the materials for investigation become more abundant.

X. He undertakes to 'show that the Church of North Africa in the days of St. Augustine held that the bishop of Rome was the supreme governor of the Church under Christ, by His divine appointment.' Let us see how this thesis is maintained.

(1) First, we find the diocesan synod of Jerusalem taking up the question of Pelagianism at the instance of the young Spanish priest Orosius. It was a Western question, for which Eastern minds were not prepared; and it was natural, therefore, that Bishop John and his priests should agree to refer it to Innocent I., and to adopt his decision.<sup>2</sup> But on second thoughts, John brought the case before a synod of Palestinian bishops, who exhibited their unpreparedness for the task which they undertook by accepting the disingenuous explanations of Pelagius in the absence of his accusers. On hearing of this result, the African bishops met at Carthage, where, four years previously, Celestius, the keen-witted associate of

<sup>1</sup> A few *errata* in foot notes to our former article, discovered too late, may here be corrected. P. 22, note 2, the mark of quotation should come before 'was'; p. 23, note 1, for 'Meletius' read 'Paulinus'; p. 25, note 3, for 'four' read 'two'; p. 26, l. 35, insert 'he' before 'died.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Universi quod ille decerneret secuturi' (Oros. *Apol.* 6).

Pelagius, had been condemned, and where the question as to the Fall and as to grace excited the deepest interest. What wonder if this Council wrote to Innocent, expressing its hope that the decisions already given in Africa might be upheld by the *apostolicæ sedis auctoritas*? The letter assumes that Pelagianism is a heresy, and tells the Pope that he ought to anathematize it. The Numidian prelates, including St. Augustine, met soon afterwards at Milevis; their letter to Innocent is much in the same tone; but when they refer to his *auctoritas* as drawn *de sanctarum Scripturarum auctoritate*, they do not mean, as our author assumes, that the Papal authority to decide such questions was 'of divine institution,' but that his teaching is sure to be based on the Scriptural grounds to which they have just been referring.<sup>1</sup> However, Mr. Rivington relies chiefly on Innocent's own replies as accepted by the African Church. 'From Peter has proceeded the episcopate itself, and the whole authority of this title;<sup>2</sup> 'the Fathers decreed, by a judgment not human but divine, that nothing done in remote provinces should be considered final until it came to the knowledge of this see, so that any just decision should be confirmed by its entire authority, and the other Churches should take from it<sup>3</sup> what they ought to enjoin,' &c. Swelling words these, which it would have been impossible for Innocent to verify: the 'Fathers' had never made any such decree,<sup>4</sup> and if 'this one rescript contains the

<sup>1</sup> The words, we are told, 'ought to be written over every page of those treatises which endeavour to enlist the witness of "the Church of North Africa in the days of St. Augustine" against the supremacy of the Holy See' (p. 287). We have no objection, provided they are given with their context. Earlier in the letter (*Aug. Ep.* 176. 3) we find, 'Quæ contra sanctas scripturas plurima disserunt.' So the Council of Carthage quotes some texts about grace, referring to 'numberless' others which might be gathered 'de scripturis omnibus,' and then almost apologizes for mentioning the texts cited 'quæ majore gratia de sede apostolica prædicant' (*Ep.* 175. 3).

<sup>2</sup> So to the Milevitan Council: 'All our fellow-bishops are bound to refer to none but Peter—that is, the author of their name and office' (*Ep.* 182). Innocent had found in the case of St. Chrysostom that no such claims would pass with the East. But Mr. Rivington misrepresents some words in his letter to five individual African prelates (*Ep.* 183. 2). He does not say 'that his sentence will have its effect in whatever part of the world Pelagius may be'; but that wherever any Pelagians may be, he 'believes that they will easily be set right when they hear of the condemnation' of their leader. The Latin is unmistakable. Mr. Rivington has combined the opening reference to what Pelagius, 'wherever he was,' had formerly done, with the mention of his 'condemnation' some eight lines further. In other words, he has not read the sentence through.

<sup>3</sup> Here, in a parenthesis, Rome is assumed to be the fountain-head of all Churches. Such is Papal 'accuracy.'

<sup>4</sup> The language goes far beyond the provisions called Sardican.



teaching of the Vatican Council entire,' that teaching rests—as we have already seen—on apocryphal history. But did the African bishops commit themselves to these statements by the mere fact of not challenging them? Consider their position: they did really ascribe to the see of Rome, as 'Apostolic and Petrine,' a very great weight and a very unique dignity; their object was to secure its 'auctoritas' on their side against Pelagianism; they would not, in such circumstances, feel bound to criticize its language about itself, but would dwell on its Catholic view of the question at issue. Some phrases of St. Augustine may be considered in a footnote.<sup>1</sup> But we must give full prominence to our author's daring, and twice repeated, defence of 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est,' as no more than 'the exact equivalent' of certain words of St. Augustine (pp. 291, 317; cf. 360). What words? He gives, fairly enough, in a translation, 'Jam enim de hac causa [*i.e.* Pelagianism] duo concilia missa sunt ad sedem apostolicam: *inde etiam rescripta venerunt: causa finita est.*'<sup>2</sup> He tells us that it has been 'customary' to represent the words which we have italicised by the formula in question, which is, he says, their 'exact equivalent'—although it gives no hint whatever of the purport of what precedes them as to the reports of two Councils, to which Rome's utterance was a reply. So then, to suppress one of the elements in a process, and to ascribe the whole result to the other, is evidently, in Roman eyes, a legitimate way of treating a document. In Anglican eyes, it is a scandalous offence against truth, and one of a numerous class of 'signs' against Rome.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The statement that Innocent had 'replied *ad omnia* in a manner worthy of the bishop of the Apostolic see,' must be taken with the words preceding, that Rome had been informed by two councils 'de hac re,' *i.e.* the discussion as to grace; and individual bishops, Augustine and four others, had also written to him 'de ipsa causa' (*Ep.* 186. 2). 'The Lord's testimony,' which Augustine says (*C. Jul.* i. 13) Innocent 'used,' was, not any 'Petrine' text, but the great saying prophetic of the Eucharist (John vi. 53).

<sup>2</sup> *Serm.* 131. 10, preached September 23, 417, before Augustine could know of Zosimus' letter in favour of Celestius, which must have been a sore disappointment to him. Gratry, in his second letter, charged the archbishop of Malines with assigning the 'Roma locuta est,' &c., to Augustine, and numbers it among the false passages 'put in circulation by the ignorance and audacity of a school of error.'

<sup>3</sup> We would here refer to an article in the *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxviii. p. 31 ff. entitled 'Certain Graver Aspects of the Roman Position;' and see p. 35<sup>8</sup> of the same volume, on falsified quotations. In 1849 Pusey wrote, 'When the passages of the Fathers' (adduced on the Roman side) 'are spurious, this makes things worse; and this is a further difficulty, that practices grew up *through forgeries*,' &c. (Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, iii. 208). On such 'forgeries' adduced as to 'the Glories of

But Zosimus succeeded Innocent; and Celestius 'deceived' him, but how? First, he gave in an evasive written statement, in which he did *not* retract the heresy imputed to him, but did submit himself to 'the judgment of the Apostolic see.' Mr. Rivington seems afraid of quoting from the extant fragments of this *libellus*; it contained a denial of *peccatum ex traduce*, which would be understood to mean a denial of original sin. Zosimus held a solemn inquiry; he asked Celestius whether his paper represented his real mind—which was to acknowledge it to be, as far as it went, satisfactory. He extracted from Celestius a condemnation of errors imputed to him,<sup>1</sup> 'according to the condemnation of them by Pope Innocent'; but nothing more explicit could be obtained, and Zosimus, as if still puzzled, adjourned the case, but then very inconsistently wrote to the African bishops, describing Celestius' faith as 'entirely sound,' expressly combining his oral statement with his *libellus*, which was, on one point, at least suggestive of heresy, and declaring that statements 'so plain and open should leave no doubt in their minds.' The Pope next took account of a long and yet more pointedly evasive paper sent by Pelagius, containing no retraction, but rather an implicit reassertion of his theory, together with a request to be corrected, if in error, by the Pope. Again the Pope was taken in; he wrote, in terms of yet stronger remonstrance, to the Africans. 'The letter of Pelagius had most abundantly cleared him';<sup>2</sup> he and Celestius were men of 'entirely sound faith,' had 'never been separated from Catholic truth,' had been victims of false accusation and hasty censure. Mr. Rivington slurs over these points, and professes to rely on St. Augustine's account as 'answering by anticipation' what Dr. Pusey has said on the case in the second part of his *Eirenicon*.<sup>3</sup> But the Mary,' see *Christian Remembrancer* for October, 1855, pp. 453 ff. It is difficult to keep this subject quite apart from a certain 'Theory of Truthfulness' discussed in *Christ. Remembr.* for January 1854.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aug. *C. duas Epp. Pel.* ii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> By way of proving it to be satisfactory, Zosimus remarks that it quite agreed with Celestius' paper.

<sup>3</sup> *On Healthful Reunion*, p. 219 ff. He notices that Augustine did not treat a formal approval of Pelagianism by the Roman Church as 'a thing impossible, but as much to be deprecated (*quod absit*).' One does not see how, if it had happened, 'Zosimus would have injured *sibi, non sedi apostolicæ*,' as Bossuet persuaded himself (*Def. Decl.* ix. 35). The assurance with which Mr. Rivington says that 'Dr. Pusey is mistaken in nearly every assertion that he makes on this subject' (p. 293), and that 'in his handling of that Pope's history' we have 'the old story of the conflict between science and religion,' is really a mental and moral phenomenon. He has inferred the assertion of 'the infallibility of the Holy See' from Innocent's words, 'Following Peter' ('*sequentes*,' not

fact is, that after Zosimus (covering his virtual retreat under something very like bluster) assured the Africans that he had not really taken a final step, tried to explain away his approval of Celestius, and afterwards, in a 'Tractoria' or circular letter (which, one would conjecture, was written for him), absolutely condemned both Pelagius and Celestius. Augustine endeavoured to meet the Pelagian charge of tergiversation against the Roman clergy by minimising their bishop's previous mistake, as if he had but provisionally or contingently acquitted the accused persons on the faith of their promise to accept his own decision.<sup>1</sup> But this will not pass. Augustine could not excuse Zosimus by ignoring some of the Pope's most significant words. It was not simply on the ground of docility, or, as Mr. Rivington says, of their 'profession of amendment' (a rather equivocal phrase), but on something more—on the ground of their written statements—that he had vindicated the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Celestius; and although he was not professing to teach Christendom *ex cathedra*, he did for the time, through ignorance and carelessness, acquit men whose language would have been intelligible enough to anyone who understood the theological issue. Is this case, then, an illustration of the 'charisma' of Popes for the guardianship of Christian doctrine? Does it justify such a section-heading as 'St. Zosimus' Support of the Faith'?

(2) The other African case is that of a wretched offender whom Rome was so imprudent as to patronise. Pope Zosimus reappears upon the scene: Apiarius, an African priest, deposed and excommunicated for gross offences,<sup>2</sup> goes to Rome, and is upheld by Zosimus. A great African council (May 1, 418) met this interference by forbidding any clerics to carry an appeal out of Africa. Thereupon Zosimus 'commis-

"cum sequamur"), 'we know how to condemn . . . and to approve' (p. 288). Here, then, is an occupant of 'the Holy See' 'approving,' as 'completely satisfactory,' statements at least suggestive of heresy. Moreover, he claims the language of an African council (about the end of 417), decreeing that 'Innocent's sentence from the see of Peter against Pelagius and Celestius should stand, until they plainly acknowledged' the true doctrine. Here the Africans were setting the authority of the late 'successor of Peter' against the present—an ingeniously respectful mode of admonishing him to reconsider his own position.

<sup>1</sup> *C. duas Epp. Pel.* ii. 5. Tillemont has a curious sentence about this, which ought, perhaps, to propitiate Mr. Rivington: 'The charity of St. Augustine, who was not writing a history in which he would have been obliged to represent things just as they were, covers this fault of Zosimus with a modest silence' (xiii. 726). 'The excuse goes beyond the words of Pope Zosimus' (Pusey, p. 222).

<sup>2</sup> See Mansi, iii. 831.

sioned his legate, Faustinus, to impress upon the Africans that the principle of his procedure had been included in the Nicene canons' (p. 297)—a wording calculated to 'impress upon' the reader that what this Pope called Nicene was Nicene. Undoubtedly Zosimus did affirm in the instructions to his legates, that the Nicene Fathers 'said'<sup>1</sup>—then followed one of the canons reckoned as Sardican, sanctioning an appeal on a *bishop's* part to 'the most blessed bishop of Rome.'<sup>2</sup> This would not directly touch the case of Apiarius; but the bishops of Africa were unable to say 'It is a Sardican canon,' for they knew not the true history of the Sardican Council; they found that the canon produced was not in their own Greek copy of the Nicene canons;<sup>3</sup> and when Faustinus repeated the citation on behalf of Boniface I., the successor of Zosimus, at the council of 419, it was resolved to ascertain the Nicene text by inquiring at Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch,<sup>4</sup> the bishop of Rome being requested to do the like on his own part.<sup>5</sup> In the interim the canon as quoted by Faustinus was to be observed. In a very short time, we are told, authenticated copies were obtained from two of the great Eastern sees;<sup>6</sup> and, of course, the canon about appeals

<sup>1</sup> 'Ita dixerunt,' wrote Zosimus, 'in concilio Nicæno,' &c. (Mansi, iv. 404).

<sup>2</sup> The Roman bishop, said this canon (Sardic. 5 or 7), might either write to the neighbouring bishops to settle the case, or send one or more persons *a latere suo* to act with them in his name. The instructions also quoted another canon (Sardic. 14 or 17) which related to a priest's appeal to 'neighbouring bishops,' not mentioning Rome.

<sup>3</sup> One of them said afterwards, in the legate's presence, with polite irony, 'I don't know how it was, but we did *not* find these words anywhere in our copies' (Mansi, iv. 404). The speaker was Augustine's intimate friend, the Alypius of his *Confessions*.

<sup>4</sup> Faustinus hinted (as Hefele understands his somewhat dark speech) that it would be sufficient for Rome to inquire, as Africa had inquired, without consulting the Easterns. His motive was obvious. But the Council did not see it in that light; and Faustinus, it seems, gave way.

<sup>5</sup> The Africans do *not* 'imply that they would be guided by Italian custom' (p. 298), as such. The passage in the synodical letter to Boniface is, as Tillemont (xiii. 783) says, 'obscure' ('Quæ si ibi,' &c.; Mansi, iv. 512). But the drift of it appears to be that they will abide by what is proved to be Nicene.

<sup>6</sup> The bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria are admitted, in p. 298, to have sent their copies; while 'Antioch did not send her canons.' Then we are referred to p. 474, where we find that 'the supposed letter from St. Cyril and from Atticus, accompanying their copies . . . is obviously a translation from the Latin, suggesting that the original was a Latin forgery, and containing terminology nowhere else found in Cyril's writings.' There are two letters (Mansi, iv. 513). It is interesting to learn that Latins as well as Greeks could 'forge'—always provided that they were not Romans! But what of the so-called correspondence between African councils and Damasus (Mansi, iii. 430)?

to Rome was conspicuous by its absence. But that is nothing to Mr. Rivington: he considers 'the most satisfactory theory' on the subject to be simply this, that the Eastern text of the Nicene canons had been mutilated by those 'busy forgers' the Arians (p. 473; cf. pp. 165, 385).

But when the information thus obtained was sent to Rome at the end of 419, did the African Church suddenly throw it overboard, and sanction episcopal appeals to Rome? So it is maintained, on the ground that, three years afterwards, Antony, the unworthy bishop of Fussala, appealed to Boniface against a sentence which had deprived him of his episcopal jurisdiction. Boniface, Pope-like, favoured the appellant: and Augustine wrote to his successor, Celestine, piteously entreating that Antony might not be supported by civil or military 'powers' employed to reimpose his presence on Fussala. This was in 423.<sup>1</sup> But in the very next year, as Hefele dates it,<sup>2</sup> the African Church returned to the subject; a council met at Carthage which put an end to its provisional acquiescence in the demands of Rome on the subject of appeals. The famous letter beginning 'Optaremus,' and addressed to Celestine, is a great annoyance to Ultramontanes, and our author has recourse to two expedients: 1. While treating it as genuine, as 'written by the Africans,' he contends that it does not 'oppose the principle of Papal jurisdiction'<sup>3</sup> (p. 299), but only objects to its exercise, in Africa, by legates *a latere*, like Faustinus, instead of by a 'commission' of African bishops<sup>4</sup>—and to a 'hasty

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 209. He quotes 1 Pet. v. 3. It was years before this, in 418, that Augustine had gone to Mauritania under directions from Zosimus, whom at that time, as Tillemont remarks, the bishops of Africa would be disposed to gratify. See Aug. *Ep.* 190. Van Espen thinks that the business was this very case of Apiarius.

<sup>2</sup> The question had again become urgent in regard to Apiarius, whom Celestine, as Mr. Rivington ventures to think, had 'unhappily absolved,' and whom his legate tried to bully the Africans into receiving. Tillemont dates the council in 426.

<sup>3</sup> However, five pages further on, it is called 'the heated letter *against appeals*,' and is apparently alluded to as 'a forged letter which *does* repudiate the supreme jurisdiction of Rome (p. 304).

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, iv. 515. Not one word in the letter about a (Papal) commission of such bishops. In the sentence which says it is 'incredible that God would give the spirit of justice *unicuilibet*, and deny it to many bishops assembled in council,' Mr. Rivington applies '*unicuilibet*' to Faustinus. But this is against the context, which sets the authority of (1) a provincial council, (2) a council of all Africa, in antithesis to that of 'anyone you can think of,' of whatever rank or position—this individual being regarded as residing beyond sea, *i.e.* at Rome; while Faustinus is mentioned as actually present in the African council. And it is only in a subsequent sentence, as if by afterthought, that the plan of a

and undue reversal' of African decisions.<sup>1</sup> 2. Then he shifts his ground. It is probably spurious—'the gravest suspicion rests upon it'; in a later context it is roundly declared 'to have every possible mark of forgery' (pp. 303. 474). The motive for this twofold and broadly incoherent criticism is obvious: the letter insists that all Church matters ought, in all reason, and on Nicene principles, to be settled by the native Church authorities; it absolutely denies any distinction, on this point, between the cases of bishops and of clergy; it dwells on the impossibility of securing a due examination of witnesses before a transmarine tribunal; and it warns Celestine against a course<sup>2</sup> which

legateship *a latere* is just referred to as unauthorized by 'any synod.' It was in the 'Sardican' canon, adduced by Popes as 'Nicene'; but the Africans had set that canon aside.

<sup>1</sup> The objections taken are very weak. The aggrieved tone is natural under such provocations. The difference between names prefixed to the letter and the list of fourteen representatives who, with Aurelius of Carthage, were appointed in 418 (not 'shortly before') to judge cases in synod (Mansi, iv. 508), is not serious; in six years or more changes are to be expected, and the record of them may have perished. This list does not 'differ altogether' from the earlier list; four names appear in both. 'Antonius' may well be, not (as Mr. Rivington repeatedly assumes) the disgraced bishop of Fussala, but the Antonius who signed the Carthaginian letter to Innocent (Mansi, iv. 321). St. Augustine may have been absent, as considering that he had said his say to Celestine. The absence of a date proves nothing, for this letter alone remains of the Acts of this council; and the letter to Boniface (Mansi, iv. 511; see Hefele, s. 122) is also undated. But then, Mr. Rivington, who had made use of that letter in p. 298, considers it to be 'suspicious' in p. 474. He says: 'Van Espen expresses himself as quite nonplussed in regard to the council from which the letter to Boniface is supposed to have emanated.' An ordinary reader would infer that Van Espen doubted the authenticity of the letter. The 'note' refers to '*Jus Eccl.* vii. § 10, art. 2, Lovanii, 1766'; a wrong reference. It is in his *Dissertatio in Synodos Africanas* that Van Espen treats of these councils. The council of which he says, '*Sat obscurum est cuius loci*,' is the first held on the affair of Apiarius (*Diss.* § x. art. 2); but he thinks it was at Cæsarea in Mauritania (Algiers). It is in art. 7 that he comes to the letter to Boniface, and considers it to have been written after the closing of the Council of Carthage, begun May 25, 419 (*Opp.* iii. 273, 278, ed. Lovan. 1753). Mr. Rivington must have looked at Van Espen hastily. And then, as to forgery: on Mr. Rivington's showing, who should forge? The African Church, he asserts, acknowledged the 'supreme jurisdiction of that see which it called . . . the Apostolic see' (p. 304). As if that phrase, applied to Rome alone in *the West*, carried with it the Papalist principle!

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* that of sending Roman clerics to carry out his orders in Africa. The reading should be, '*Executores etiam clericos vestros quibusque petentibus* [not 'potentibus,' as in Mansi's text] *nolite mittere*,' &c. Mr. Rivington dwells (p. 359) on '*lest we* should seem to introduce,' &c. But this is a polite way of advising *him* not to present himself in that light.



would 'introduce into the Church the smoky arrogance of the world.' And this may suffice about the Church of Africa.

XI. Three questions arise as to the relation of the Council of Ephesus to the Roman see.<sup>1</sup> (1) What was the nature of the authority exercised by Celestine I. when he commissioned Cyril to act for him in the case of Nestorius? (2) When the Council was summoned, did this commission 'devolve' (as Mr. Rivington maintains) upon it? (3) When it met, did it (as Mr. Rivington holds) act as Celestine's instrument and minister?

(1) It was in the summer of 430 that Cyril wrote a synodical letter to Celestine, giving an account of the Nestorian controversy up to that date. 'Long-standing usages of the Church,' he says, 'induce him to communicate the facts to Celestine'; he feels that he 'must needs' do so, although heretofore he has not written on the subject either to Celestine or to any other of their 'fellow-ministers'—a phrase which shows that in this connexion he regards the bishop of Rome as a *primus inter pares*, and, having resolved to warn the episcopate at large, begins naturally with him. He will not separate himself from the communion of Nestorius until he has thus informed Celestine, whom, therefore, he requests *τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν*.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington understands this as an application for a final judicial decision which 'the Pope alone' could give. The Latin translation of Cyril's letter simply renders, 'quid hic sentias præscribere';<sup>3</sup> and this is supported by what follows, for Cyril tells Celestine that he ought to make known his mind (*σκόπον*) to the Macedonian and the Oriental bishops. We shall presently see that the Oriental bishops did not regard Celestine as the one supreme judge of such a question. Celestine summons a council at Rome, and in its behalf replies to Cyril; he calls it 'a great triumph for his belief that Cyril adduces such strong proof in support of it.' Is this the language of a Pope who, as Mr. Rivington words it, 'at once assumes his infalli-

<sup>1</sup> It is a pleasure to agree entirely with Mr. Rivington (p. 305) as to the vital importance of the doctrine secured at Ephesus. But he might as well have brought out more clearly the difference between a 'substantial' and an 'accidental' union. The one secures our Lord's personal Divinity, the other reduces Him to a pre-eminent saint. This was, in fact, the issue raised.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, iv. 1016.

<sup>3</sup> Our author, *more suo*, reiterates his gloss on *τυπῶσαι* and *τύπος*, and infers from such terms that Celestine 'resumes in himself the apostolic government of the Christian Church,' &c. (p. 315). Of course, therefore, he renders *καταξίωσον* by 'deign'; but see the word as used in Mansi, iv. 1057, for 'be so good as,' &c.



bility'? He desires Cyril to take a certain line of action as his representative. But here Mr. Rivington objects to Canon Bright's rendering of an important clause as 'join the authority of our see to your own' (p. 313). He substitutes 'assuming the authority of our see' (p. 309). But a man who had no official authority might 'assume the authority' of one who appoints him a plenipotentiary, as a Pope might make a mere deacon his legate; and the words, as read by Cyril in Greek, are 'the authority of our see having been *combined* (*συναφθείσης*) with yours,' so as to recognize in Cyril an authority with which Celestine's was to be linked.<sup>1</sup> Cyril is told to 'act authoritatively as taking Celestine's place.' But Celestine proceeds to say that unless Nestorius, 'within ten days after receiving his admonition,' gives written assurance of agreement with the faith of the Roman and Alexandrian Churches, and of all Christians in general, Cyril is to 'provide for' the Church of Constantinople, and Nestorius is to know that he is separated from 'our body.' Nestorius is similarly warned that in that case he must regard himself as 'ejected from all communion with the Catholic Church.'<sup>2</sup> Celestine writes in a like sense to the orthodox at Constantinople;<sup>3</sup> and to John, patriarch of Antioch, he writes that this sentence has been uttered by himself, 'or rather by Christ' (a phrase used also in the letter to Cyril), and that Nestorius, on failing to give satisfaction, will be in the position of one 'removed from the assembly of bishops.'<sup>4</sup> Mr. Rivington treats this language as expressing a Papal claim to the full extent of the Vatican decree. But Celestine here lays stress on the complete doctrinal accord between Cyril and himself; he is certain that what they thus hold is the very truth revealed in Christ; he confidently assumes that it is this, and nothing else, which all Churches hold; and he infers that all Churches will agree with Rome and Alexandria in excommunicating a bishop who denies it. This is further illustrated by Cyril's letter to John of Antioch, written after he had received the commission of Celestine.<sup>5</sup> On Mr. Rivington's showing, Cyril knew that he and any other bishop must absolutely bow to Celestine's judgment as being, *because*

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 1020. Mr. Rivington says that 'there is nothing in the Latin or Greek exactly corresponding to 'his own' (*i.e.* Cyril's). He quotes *σὸς*, but leaves out *συναφθείσης*. The Latin, it is true, has 'adscita.'

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, iv. 1036.

<sup>3</sup> This letter has a beautiful passage on St. Athanasius, followed by a truly Christian reminder as to that everlasting 'country' of which no exile in this world can deprive Christ's servants.

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, iv. 1050.

<sup>5</sup> Mansi, *I.c.*

his, the judgment of Christ delivered through His vicar. If he held this, we know how he must have written to John. How, then, does he write? Does he say, in effect, 'You and I, of course, must obey the bishop of Rome as our sovereign ruler and our infallible guide'? Nothing like it. He says: 'A clear direction has been given' (using the word *τετύπωκε*) 'by the holy synod of the Romans' (so above, 'the pious bishops who were found in the great city of Rome'), 'whom it is necessary for those to follow (*πειθισθαι*) who cling to communion with the whole West.' He adds that 'they have written to Rufus of Thessalonica, and to some other Macedonian bishops, who always concur *ταῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ ψήφοις*, and also to Juvenal of Elia [Jerusalem]. It is then for your Piety to consider what is expedient; for we shall follow the decisions given' . . . [here Mr. Rivington proceeds] 'by him,' meaning Celestine, and the Greek text has *παρ' αὐτοῦ*; but this is clearly an iteration, by oversight, of the previous *παρ' αὐτοῦ*, for the context requires *παρ' αὐτῶν*, and so the Latin version has 'quæ *illi* judicaverunt,' and Cyril adds, 'fearing to fall away from the communion,' not (as Mr. Rivington renders) "of such" (*i.e.* the whole West'), but 'of so many.' It is necessary to insist on this, because Mr. Rivington (p. 315) misrepresents the passage as recognizing an '*ex cathedra* judgment on a matter of faith' in the sense of the Vatican decree. Now let us ask whether it is conceivable that a patriarch of Alexandria (that is, of a Church very closely associated with Rome), if he held what that decree affirms to be of faith, could sink the obligation of obeying Christ's Vicar in the 'expediency' of keeping on good terms with 'the whole West'; or whether, if he thought the 'Roman synod' the mere 'apparatus'<sup>1</sup> of one man's sovereign 'judgment,' he would thus have put the instrument for the *causa efficiens*. Next, let us look at John's letter to his friend Nestorius.<sup>2</sup> On Vaticanist principles, they both knew that Celestine as Pope had a 'plenary, ordinary, and immediate' jurisdiction over them and their Churches; that, in a word, he was their pastor and their sovereign, and that to resist him was sheer rebellion against the Divine 'Bishop of souls.' Now, when John would persuade Nestorius to accept 'Theotocos' within the term (short, he says, but long enough) prescribed by 'my lord Celestine' (*ὁ κύριός μου* being a familiar title of respect), does he appeal to any such relation between the Constantinopolitan see and the Roman? By no means. His

<sup>1</sup> See Rivington, p. 428, on the character of a Roman synod.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, iv. 1061.

argument is: We of the East have just got rid of the trouble caused by dissension with the West; if you stand stiffly out against the adoption of a word which is really orthodox, 'the West, and Egypt, and perhaps Macedonia,' will again be in formal separation from the East. There is not a word in the letter which can be interpreted in the Papalist sense.<sup>1</sup>

(2) There was, we are told, 'no limitation in point of time in respect of' the commission given by Celestine to Cyril (p. 322). How can this be, when it expressly specifies 'ten days' as the period within which Nestorius is to retract on pain of immediate excommunication? Cyril himself not less expressly refers to the 'period' thus assigned;<sup>2</sup> he describes himself as 'acting in conjunction with the holy synod assembled at Rome under the presidency of his brother and fellow-minister Celestine' (words which Mr. Rivington passes over) when he gives the third (and evidently the final) warning, 'Unless you adopt the right faith' (*i.e.* within ten days) 'know that you have no part with us nor any place among God's priests and bishops.' Is he not regarding himself as fulfilling the charge contained in Celestine's letter, and announcing the Roman and Alexandrian ultimatum? True, he had also been instructed, in such case, to provide a new bishop for Constantinople. But this was impracticable; and what Cyril could do, that he did. Mr. Rivington struggles to make out that the commission was not 'exhausted' by his action (p. 322), but survived to pass on to the council as summoned by Theodosius. But a commission cannot be at once fulfilled and unfulfilled. If it is fulfilled as far as is possible, it is necessarily 'exhausted.' If the recipient is to take further action, he must get a new commission. So stood matters at the close of 430: Nestorius had not simply ignored the requirement pressed upon him; he had met Cyril's twelve articles by counter-anathematisms of his own. He was therefore, by the very terms of the commission, *ipso facto* excluded from the communion of Rome

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rivington is not quite satisfied with its 'tone,' but considers that it 'urges obedience.' Certainly it does not, in the sense which he requires. He also refers to τὸν ὁρισθέντα ῥύπον in Cyril's letter to Juvenal of Jerusalem. But Cyril there gives his reason for sending on Celestine's letter, 'to stir up your zeal . . . and that we may with one heart . . . save our imperilled flocks,' Mansi, iv. 1060.

<sup>2</sup> Τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν προθεσμίαν, *Ep. ad Nest.* 3. 2. It is quite arbitrary to say that 'the very terms of the commission implied its continuance' beyond that period. Mr. Rivington says, as if he had read it in black and white, that 'the Pontiff had left the execution of his sentence, including its delay (if deemed advisable), to the synod' (p. 336). When, and in what words?

and Alexandria. But Theodosius, under his prompting, had summoned a General Council to meet in Ephesus at the ensuing Pentecost. In the letter of invitation, he had ruled that 'no new steps should in the interim be taken by any individuals,'<sup>1</sup> and by this, as Tillemont puts it, he had 'arrested, in effect, the decrees of the Council of Rome.' The action, then, of Celestine in August, and of Cyril about the end of October, was suspended by the Emperor's act, which cut straight across the lines of their policy. Indeed, the very *raison d'être* of a General Council was to bring on the stage a fuller authority than that of one or of two patriarchs. Naturally, they were disappointed; naturally, they tried to minimize the effect of the citation, and to think of the arrangements of August as still somehow inchoate. But in such a case facts must outweigh words; and if Celestine, according to Mr. Rivington, 'virtually owned the commission originally given as still running,' or if Cyril thought that 'he was but continuing on the ground of the original commission,' we can only say that no one can alter the grammatical scope of his own once published words. The *vox missa*, in that sense, will not 'return' for his convenience. As for Mr. Rivington's assertion that the council was summoned with Celestine's 'consent' (p. 318), he consented in that he made the best of the situation. But does anyone imagine that Theodosius asked his leave before issuing a peremptory citation?<sup>2</sup>

(3) The council met in June 431.<sup>3</sup> Cyril presided, partly as bishop of Alexandria, partly as 'managing the place of Celestine,' just as Flavian of Philippi 'occupied the place' of Rufus.<sup>4</sup> Was he, then, commissioned to represent Celestine at the council? 'It is difficult,' as Tillemont tersely remarks (xiv. 393), 'to see how the commission of August 430 could extend to enabling him to act for Celestine at the council which was not summoned until November;' and Celestine, when writing to Cyril on May 7, had said nothing of any such delegation, nor had he instructed his actual legates to

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 1113; Tillemont, xiv. 364.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington is following Baronius, *Ann.* v. 732: whom Tillemont drily criticizes, xiv. 759. But Baronius is not responsible for the assertion (made by way of correcting Dr. Bright) that 'St. Leo's summary of the Council is, that it was "convoked by the precept of Christian princes and the consent of the Apostolical see"' (p. 318). Here Mr. Rivington once more betrays himself; for Leo is speaking of the Council of Chalcedon in a letter to the bishops who had composed it (*Ep.* 114. 1).

<sup>3</sup> That Cyril did act impatiently as to the opening, see Bright, *Waymarks*, &c., p. 150 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, iv. 1124.

treat Cyril as their chief, but only to take counsel with him.<sup>1</sup> However, Cyril was not likely to be punctilious in such a matter, and 'might well assume that Celestine would not disavow him on that head.'<sup>2</sup> Now let us look at the conduct of the bishops assembled. Did they regard themselves as simply Celestine's agents for the carrying out of his previous sentence against a heretic? This must have been their view if, however erroneously, they had regarded the commission of August as 'devolving' upon them. They would then have had one, and only one, question to ask: Had Nestorius, at the expiration of his term of grace, given satisfaction to Cyril, and therefore to Celestine? Five minutes would have sufficed for proving that he had done the very contrary; and then the council would have promulgated the Papal sentence, and proceeded to take measures for the filling up of the vacated Constantinopolitan see. Instead of this, the assembled prelates spent a whole midsummer day, even until dark,<sup>3</sup> in going through the whole mass of pertinent evidence, after repeated formal citations calling on 'the most religious bishop Nestorius to present himself among them.'<sup>4</sup> Even after his third refusal they did not at once condemn him for contumacy: they elaborately tested Cyril's teaching, which Celestine had solemnly approved, by the Creed of Nicæa; but whereas, on Papalist principles, they should have put in the very forefront his third letter as conveying the Papal ultimatum, they only listened to it, and abstained from giving it an express synodical approval. Instead of simply accepting Cyril's and Celestine's estimate of the language used by Nestorius, and treating it as already proved to be heretical, they professedly inquired whether his letter to Cyril was, like Cyril's own letter, 'in accordance with what was put forth by the holy Fathers at Nicæa'; they condemned it as 'wholly contrary' to that standard, and to Cyril's second letter; they heard evidence as to his recent reiterations of heresy; they read seventeen extracts from approved theologians; they went through twenty passages from the sermons of Nestorius;

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 556.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington makes a difficulty about Cyril's proposal that a 'second' imperial decree should be read, beside the letter of citation dated November 19, 430, on the ground that it directed the bishops to take up the question of doctrine 'without any delay.' This 'second decree' was the letter in Mansi, iv. 1117, which, however, merely ruled that the question of doctrine should take precedence of others.

<sup>3</sup> They were escorted home with lights, Mansi, iv. 1241.

<sup>4</sup> *Συνεδρεῖναι* is used on the first occasion, Mansi, iv. 1132. Probably, had he come, he would have had a seat in the midst, as Dioscorus had at Chalcedon. But until his deposition by the council, 'he was treated as

and then, at last, they pronounced his condemnation.<sup>1</sup> Before we come to it, let us notice Mr. Rivington's remark: 'It was St. Celestine's expressed desire that they should satisfy themselves as to the heterodoxy of Nestorius,' and so 'should give to his judgment a rational adhesion.' If this was his 'desire,' it was beyond the scope of the commission on which, according to Mr. Rivington, they were acting; and no 'desire' of his was made known to them until the arrival of the legates—that is, nineteen days after the memorable 22 June. Mr. Rivington exults over one clause in the council's sentence against Nestorius, which he renders, 'necessarily compelled by the canons and by the letter of our most holy father and fellow-minister,<sup>2</sup> Celestine' (p. 334). It is not 'necessarily compelled,' but 'necessarily' or 'irresistibly urged;' but let that pass. In the missives to Nestorius himself, and to his clergy, the council mentions the canons and not Celestine.<sup>3</sup> The canons, and Celestine's letter to Nestorius, cannot here be treated as coordinate; for the council had *not* rendered literal obedience to that letter; its purport was broadly inconsistent with any laborious examination of the opinions of the man whom he had therein branded as a 'wolf.' The words, then, cannot be strained into meaning that 'the compulsory nature of the' previous 'Papal decision' was presumed' by the synodical sentence, which 'added nothing to its intrinsic authority'; they simply indicate that the bishops desired to utilize to the utmost the fact that the greatest see in the Church was on their side, as against the bishop of the Eastern capital, who was understood to be

bishop of Constantinople, the Roman council's decree notwithstanding' (Tillemont, xiv. 364). He is called 'most religious' until the general 'exclamation' against him in Mansi (iv. 1178), and even once afterwards.

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 1169-1212. 'He was deposed, not by virtue of the Pope's judgment, which had been read, but on the proofs which were given of his false teaching' (Tillemont, *l. c.*). 'Celestine,' says Mr. Rivington, 'considered himself as clothed with apostolic authority which he could exercise, *as we have seen*, by deposing . . . the bishop of Constantinople' (p. 480). 'We have seen' that the council deposed that bishop; it could not, therefore, have recognised 'apostolic authority' as having already done so.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington takes the first of these two titles in a distinctively Papal sense, not knowing that in the first session it is repeatedly applied to Cyril. The second, he imagines, means only that Celestine and the bishops were alike in priests' orders! Any one who had studied the documents would know that it means 'fellow-bishop.' *Λειτουργία* is frequently used for the 'ministry' of a bishop (see Euseb. ii. 24, iii. 13). In the Acts of Ephesus the title of archbishop is given seven times to Celestine, seventy-five times to Cyril.

• Mansi, iv. 1228.



patronized by the court, and to have many sympathisers in the Antiochene patriarchate—the 'Orient' technically so called. And when, on July 11, the Roman 'legates' appeared in the council, they brought a letter from Celestine<sup>1</sup> which requires rather more comment than is given in Mr. Rivington's text; but in one of his Appendices he returns to it, and urges that, although the Pope speaks of the Apostolic teachership as having 'descended in common to all bishops' ('hæc ad omnes in commune Domini sacerdotes mandatæ prædicationis cura pervenit'), he does not say that it has descended to them 'equally' (p. 480). We ask in reply: Where does he say that it has come to him in a unique sense as the teacher of the Church Universal? Where does he differentiate his own share of the 'teachership' from that of other successors of the Twelve? Where does he distinguish his own position from theirs, as the 'priest's' is distinguished from the 'people's' in 'common prayer'? (p. 482). Mr. Rivington, indeed, pretends that Celestine identifies his relation to the bishops with that of St. Paul to Timothy (p. 339). This is a peculiarly audacious gloss. What Celestine says is:

'We must act by labouring in common, that we may preserve what has been entrusted [to us], and hitherto retained *per apostolicam successionem*.<sup>2</sup> For this is now required of us, to walk according to the Apostle. . . . We must take up spiritual arms. . . . The blessed Apostle Paul admonishes all who are now stationed in the place where he ordered Timothy to remain. . . . Let us, therefore, now do and aim at that which Timothy undertook as incumbent on him, "ne quis aliter sentiat" [referring to 1 Tim. i. 3, 4]. Let us be of one mind, . . . since the faith which is one is being struck at,' &c.

Is not Fleury warranted in saying that Celestine here 'places himself in the rank of the bishops'?<sup>3</sup> It is true that

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 1283.

<sup>2</sup> He had said before, 'Hæreditario in hanc solitudinem jure constringimur [i.e. all bishops] quicunque . . . eorum vice nomen Domini prædicamus, dum illis dicitur, "Ite, docete omnes gentes." Advertere debet vestra fraternitas quia accepimus generale mandatum . . . subeamus omnes eorum labores, quibus omnes successimus in honore,' &c. So afterwards: 'Quæ fuit apostolorum petitio deprecantium? Nempe ut acciperent "verbum Dei loqui cum fiducia" . . . Et vestro nunc sancto conventui quid est aliud postulandum,' &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Eccl. Hist.* xxv. c. 47. Mr. Rivington refers to the bishops' acclamations 'to Celestine, the guardian of the faith!' Literalism consistently applied to such language would produce curious results. Compare the greetings addressed to an emperor in the sixth session of Chalcedon; e.g. 'O teacher of the faith!' (Mansi, vii. 177). When the council applies to Celestine and Cyril alike the title of 'a new Paul,' Mr. Rivington is sure that Cyril was viewed simply as Celestine's representative; and when it hails Celestine as τῷ ἀποστόλῳ τῆς συνόδου, this is turned round,



he refers at the end to what he had 'previously ordained' as to be 'carried out' by his three legates; and there is also a difficulty as to the text of the final clause, where the Latin 'id quod agitur' is not in accordance with the Greek ὅπερ αὐν γινώτε.<sup>1</sup>

Let us now see what follows. The successor of St. Basil acknowledges that Celestine's Apostolical see had previously given a direction, and that they had followed and carried it out; but he immediately adds, 'by pronouncing against Nestorius a canonical and apostolical judgment.'<sup>2</sup> In the next session one of the legates, *more Romano*, refers to our Lord's words to St. Peter, and affirms that the Apostle 'up to this time and always lives and exercises judgment in his successors';<sup>3</sup> another speaks of himself and his brethren as sent by Celestine to 'execute' his resolves. But what says Cyril himself?<sup>4</sup> He takes care (a) to describe the legates as representing, not only 'the Apostolical see,' but 'all the holy synod of the bishops of the West,' and (b) to distinguish *their* action, as Celestine's real 'agents,' from the sentence already pronounced by the synod. But Mr. Rivington fastens on the subsequent declaration of the bishops that the legates had spoken ἀκολουθῶς (Lat. *consentanea*). 'It is enough,' he exclaims; 'we ought . . . to hear no such accusations as to Rome's disregard for history as are indulged in by some writers, whose position is absolutely excluded by the history of the Council of Ephesus. . . . The teaching of the Vatican decree on this subject [the Church's government] was the teaching of the Fathers of Ephesus, and it was the rule of their conduct' (p. 347). Was it so, indeed? We need not repeat the terms of the decree; but does this declaration commit the council to everything which as it were, to mean that the council's 'judgment' was but 'an intelligent

adhesion to the Papal sentence'! (p. 339).

<sup>1</sup> A various reading of the Greek agrees with the Latin.

<sup>2</sup> Firmus: Mansi, iv. 1288. Bossuet: 'Sic exsequitur synodus generalis primæ sedis sententiam legitima cognitione et inquisitione, nec simplicis mandatarii vice, sed canonico et apostolico dato iudicio' (*Def. Decl.* vii. 13). Mr. Rivington (who seems to think that the *Defensio* is not wholly Bossuet's) does, in fact, reduce the 'general council' to the position of a dignified 'mandatarius' of the Pope. With Celestine's letter fresh in memory, a Cappadocian primate was hardly likely to mean that all 'apostolical' authority was concentrated in Rome.

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, iv. 1295. Mr. Rivington says that 'East and West, at Ephesus, agreed in' this (p. 371). So, again, he assumes that 'the East to a man believed' what a legate said about 'Peter judging in his successors' (p. 382). The notion that Easterns believed whatever they heard and did not contradict, shows a curious lack of humour.

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, iv. 1300.

a Roman envoy might say about the dignity of his master? Does not the context show that the council was referring to the legates' agreement with its decisions? One of them had just said that they were 'bound to affirm its teaching,'<sup>1</sup> according to what had been done in it': then comes the remark, 'Since they have spoken ἀκολούθως, it follows that they should 'make good their own promise, and affirm what has been done by their signatures'; whereupon they sign the minutes, one of them as 'entirely assenting to (ἐξακολουθῶν) the just judgment of this holy and œcumenical synod.' We need only add that in the synodical letters to Theodosius, Celestine is 'commended for having condemned the heresy before our decision' (ψήφου), and the legates are said to represent both him and 'the whole synod of the West.'<sup>2</sup> As to any notion of obedience in the Papalist sense being due to Celestine from the 'Œcumenical Council,' there is not a single word. We may well say with Bossuet that at the outset, 'Ipsa synodus intellexit omnia ipso jure in suspenso esse, atque ex synodi pendere sententia;' and that, in the proceedings, the council so acted as to show that Celestine's judgment was *not* regarded as 'ultimum atque irreformabile.'

But this, which Bossuet denies, is what his Church now affirms to have been acknowledged from the first. Mr. Rivington placidly assumes that when Cyril in the fourth session spoke of the council as having had the task of 'confirming the right definition of the apostolic faith,' he meant, 'of course, the ὀρισθέντα τύπον of Celestine. But Celestine's 'direction' was *not* a definition of the faith; and a little more acquaintance with ancient dogmatic phraseology would have saved Mr. Rivington from this blunder. Just before the Creed was read, in the first session, the purpose in hand was stated by Juvenal—'to establish the right faith,'<sup>3</sup> *i.e.* as formulated by the Nicene Council. This faith, or rather Creed, was to be confirmed, not as any bishop's teaching could be confirmed, but in the sense of being synodically reaffirmed; and so, when the African primate's letter<sup>4</sup> had been read, it was summarized by Cyril as aiming at the 'confirmation of the ancient doctrines of the faith'; and in his great letter to

<sup>1</sup> This must be the sense of ἐαυτῶν διδασκαλίας—*leg. αὐτῶν*, Lat. '*eorum doctrinam*.'

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, iv. 1240, 1301, 1433, 1461.

<sup>3</sup> A like phrase has been used still earlier (Mansi, iv, 1133).

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Rivington summarizes this letter (p. 317) as saying that 'the bishops of Africa have accepted the decision of the Holy See,' yet quotes it fairly as referring also to 'the judgment of the bishops agreeing together' as against Pelagianism.

John he writes: 'We cannot allow the Nicene Creed to be unsettled.'<sup>1</sup> The council, too, in its letter to Celestine, speaks of Nestorius' error as 'dislodging from its basis the economy of the mystery.' Mr. Rivington cites this letter for the sake of two remarks in it, that the council felt it a matter of 'necessary duty to report to Celestine all its proceedings'—which, considering his eminent position, was natural enough—and that, although it might 'justly and lawfully' have deposed John, it had 'reserved his case for Celestine's judgment' (p. 353). And here is an illustration of Mr. Rivington's method. He makes the council give as its reason for this reservation, that 'the matter concerned one of the "greater thrones,"' a phrase taken from a subsequent paragraph relating (as he himself intimates) to a different point;<sup>2</sup> he glosses the assertion of a right to depose John, as if it depended on the presence of Roman legates; and he omits the reason actually assigned for not doing so—'that by forbearance we might overcome his temerity.' Once more, he assumes that three Cyprian bishops spoke untruly when they claimed a traditional independence of Antioch;<sup>3</sup> and he affirms this with a positiveness which contrasts with the language of such great scholars as Tillemont and Le Quien. His reason is, that Innocent I. had pronounced 'that the Cyprians ought to return to their obedience.' But Innocent's letter avowedly proceeds upon an *ex parte* statement;<sup>4</sup> and how, on Vatican principles, could a General Council, even provisionally, reverse the alleged 'decision' of a Pope? He pours scorn on Dr. Bright's suggestion that there may have been some connexion between the African bishops' deprecation—in that previous letter to Celestine which he wishes to represent as spurious—of acts which would introduce into the Church 'the smoky arrogance of the world,' and the Ephesine resolution *re* Cyprus, forbidding bishops to usurp jurisdiction beyond their own

<sup>1</sup> Cyr. *Op.* ed. P. E. Pusey, vi. 50. Compare with κρατυνθῆναι (Cyril's phrase), Mansi, iv. 1344, that 'the synod decreed κρατεῖν . . . τὴν πίστιν'; and on ὅρον, Cyr. *Adv. Nest.* i. 5, 'the symbol which the Nicene Fathers ὁρίσαντο,' and cf. Mansi, iv. 1361, and Soc. i. 37, &c.

<sup>2</sup> The excommunication directed against Cyril and Memnon by John of Antioch and his supporters (Mansi, iv. 1336). In p. 353 Antioch seems to be called a 'greater throne,' in p. 351 it is expressly called a 'lesser throne' than Alexandria. But the council means to include Ephesus as well as Alexandria among sees of this class, not to exclude Antioch.

<sup>3</sup> One of them said: 'They cannot prove that from the Apostles' times he of Antioch, or any other, ever imparted to our island the grace of ordination' (Mansi, iv. 1468).

<sup>4</sup> 'Cyprios sane *asseris* . . . Quocirca *persuademus* eis,' &c. (Innocent to Alexander of Antioch: Mansi, iii. 1055).

bounds, 'lest under the guise of episcopal action there should creep in the arrogance of [worldly] authority.' The resemblance is almost a verbal identity; it seems to demand some explanation. Eastern bishops a hundred years before had shown some jealousy of Roman self-assertion; is it incredible that these Eastern bishops should have meant to give Rome a quiet hint?<sup>1</sup> The greatest Asiatic bishop of the fourth century had complained of the 'haughty bearing' of that same Roman bishop whose accession, compromised by sanguinary conflicts, had given occasion to a Pagan historian to dwell sarcastically on the pomp and wealth which made his see an object of ambition. Eastern bishops were not simple enough to think its occupants, as such, inaccessible to the temptation of domineering; and such of them as were alive some fourteen years later would probably feel that their words had been unconsciously prophetic of Leo's attempt to subjugate the Church of Gaul by the aid of an imperial rescript, containing language which, as Tillemont says, 'does little honour' to his memory.<sup>2</sup>

XII. At last we come to the Council of Chalcedon. At the end of the trial of Eutyches in Flavian's council of Con-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ath. *Apol. c. Ari.* 25. In page 359, referring to 'Dr. Bright's imagination,' Mr. Rivington says: 'He thinks that the Roman legates at Ephesus may have been absent from that particular session which dealt with the Cyprian case.' And yet we read in page 357: 'This decision was probably arrived at after their [the legates'] withdrawal, and so was merely a provisional arrangement pending further inquiry.' He also denies that Besulas, an African deacon, represented Africa at the Council. But at the end of the list of members we find, 'Besulas deacon of Carthage.' He represented his primate (Mansi, iv. 1128, 1208).

<sup>2</sup> Valentinian III. was made to say, 'Since the primacy of the Apostolic see has been confirmed by the merit of St. Peter the dignity of the city of Rome, and also the authority of a sacred synod, *ne quid præter auctoritatem sedis istius illicitum præsumptio attentare nitatur*, for then will the peace of the Churches everywhere be preserved, *si rectorem suum agnoscat universitas*.' Neither the 'Sardican' provisions, which Leo persists in referring to as Nicene (*Epp.* 43, 44), nor the Roman version of Nic. can. 6, would justify this inference, for which Leo must be held responsible. The rescript orders that 'whatever the authority of the Apostolic see has directed, or shall direct, is to be law throughout the provinces,' i.e. of the West. Yet Leo could write of another bishop 'Propria perdit qui indebita concupiscit' (*Ep.* 104. 3): a pregnant maxim, which sums up our case in regard to his own see. We ought, perhaps, to notice the argument that if the canons referred to had really been Sardican, Leo would have had 'no reason for quoting them as Nicene, since, as Sardican, they would have been a sufficient authority for his purpose' in writing to the Eastern emperor. But the Sardican Council was not known, in the East, to have put forth any canons; and in any case a Western synod could not have had as much 'authority' as the Nicene, nor have suited Leo nearly so well.

stan  
bro  
cert  
the  
syno  
Rivi  
Jeru  
him  
know  
the  
to I  
met  
chan  
Cou  
natu  
as s  
som  
Mr.  
the  
and  
judg  
fers  
docu  
the  
of H  
Con  
brief  
at C  
the  
hum  
by a  
take  
Leo  
dosi  
This  
and  
Papa  
mon  
1  
Mr. R  
speak  
Thes  
2  
4  
appea  
of Le

stantinople (November 448), we find that, after the assembly broke up, the condemned abbot, in a low voice, appealed to certain foreign 'synods.' What were they? According to the 'patrician' Florentius, to whom he had spoken, 'the synods of Rome, and of Egypt, and of Jerusalem.'<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rivington ingeniously recasts this: 'to an Egyptian and Jerusalemite, *as well as to a Roman council*;' and then sets himself to minimise the reference to the two former. We know nothing, he argues, of any letter from Eutyches, except the one to Leo: therefore, we may practically treat the appeal to Leo as standing alone (p. 366). This is a 'short and easy' method, indeed; but it happens that Eutyches, in 449, charged Flavian with ignoring his appeal to a General Council.<sup>2</sup> Then as to Leo's correspondence with Flavian; he naturally thought that Flavian 'ought to have written' to him as soon as Eutyches did. Flavian's first letter was, in fact, somehow delayed, but in his second he gives a full account.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Rivington grandiloquently describes him as 'invoking the Papal prerogative,' acting as a 'judge of first instance,' and 'bringing Eutyches before Leo' for a 'final peremptory judgment'; and the heading of page 369 runs, '*Flavian prefers a Papal Brief*'—something, we presume, in the style of documents sealed with 'the Fisherman's ring,' and menacing the disobedient with the 'indignation of Almighty God, and of His apostles Peter and Paul.' He makes the bishop of Constantinople say, 'Deign to give your decision by means of briefs, in accordance with the canonical deposition of Eutyches' at Constantinople. How many of his readers will turn to the original? Those who do so will find Flavian in no such humble attitude; he asks Leo to 'give assent (*συμφηφίσασθαι*) by a letter of his own, to the deposition which *has* canonically taken place,' and he adds that nothing now is wanted save Leo's 'impulse and assistance' to tell on the mind of Theodosius, and to stop the mischievous scheme for a new council.<sup>4</sup> This is natural enough on the theory of a primacy of position and influence; but no rotundity of phrase in a modern Papalist comment can puff it out into a recognition of Papal monarchy. Nor is there in the last paragraph of that famous

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, vi. 817. The monk Constantine's account is set aside by Mr. Rivington, because he was 'convicted of untrustworthiness.' Yet, speaking *for* Eutyches, he had named another synod also—that of Thessalonica.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, vi. 641.

<sup>3</sup> Leon. *Ep.* 26.

<sup>4</sup> If Theodosius had recognized Leo's see as 'the supreme court of appeal,' he would not have entertained and acted on this scheme in spite of Leo's objections (*Ep.* 37).

and inestimable letter to Flavian, which is known as Leo's 'Tome,' anything like a claim of real supremacy; while, even had the language been stronger, the œcumenical acceptance of the Tome had reference to its splendidly complete exposition of the great doctrine on which Christianity is based.

In Leo's letter to the unhappy council which he afterwards, with excusable exaggeration, branded as 'a meeting of robbers,' the object in view is described: 'that all error may be done away with by a fuller judgment.'<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rivington forthwith glosses: 'the sentence of the Pope was to swell out and be completed by its synodical proclamation, as the sufferings of Christ were completed by those of His followers' (p. 377). By aid of this most gratuitous and hardly reverent illustration, a council intended to be œcumenical is degraded into a mere Papal consistory; and while Leo's account of the pledge given by Eutyches, 'per omnia nostram se secuturum sententiam,' is translated into a 'promise to obey the Holy See,' the part to be taken by the council is thus described: 'his legates were to determine with the holy assembly of the episcopal brotherhood "what things will be pleasing to the Lord."' Is 'with' here intended as an adequate representation of *communi vobiscum sententia*?

That Leo, alike in his great official position, and in his force of character and religious earnestness,<sup>2</sup> was the man to deliver the Church from this Eutychian peril, will be admitted by all who believe in the One Christ as 'perfect God and perfect Man,' with gratitude due to him for that steady theological balance whereby, while the error of the time is being exposed, no grain of advantage is given to its Nestorian opposite. He went much too far, we believe, in magnifying his own bishopric, by consolidating and formulating the 'Petrine' ideas which had long grown up among its clergy;<sup>3</sup> but let us not underrate the significance of his words when, in attempting to work upon the Eastern Court for the redress of wrongs done by the 'Latrocinium,' he speaks as the mouth-piece of 'omnes nostrarum partium ecclesiæ, omnesque sacerdotes' (even as afterwards he speaks of writings of his as sent to Constantinople '*non solum* apostolicæ sedis auctoritate,

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 33. Theodosius had *not* implied, as Leo chooses to suppose, that he desired to get an exposition of Peter's confession 'from Peter himself,' *i.e.* from his see. This was a Roman *modus loquendi*.

<sup>2</sup> A great man, being also first among bishops, and Roman patriarch, with the *prestige* of the 'Petrine' tradition, would be quite strong enough for what Leo succeeded in doing. An acknowledged spiritual monarch, supreme alike in East and West, would have done more.

<sup>3</sup> See Gore, *Leo the Great*, p. 99.



*sed etiam sanctæ synodi, quæ ad nos frequens convenerat, unanimitate*').<sup>1</sup> This, according to Mr. Rivington, refers merely to such bishops as happened to be in Rome, whose authority, when sitting with him in synod, was due to him alone—as if they were but a sort of cabinet council to the Sovereign of the entire Church. But Leo means Theodosius to understand that he has the Western Church at his back; one is reminded of Cyril's care to insist that Celestine and his legates represent the Western hierarchy. Yet all the urgency of Leo,<sup>2</sup> supported by the Western emperor and princesses, fails utterly with a pious but feeble prince bred up under the influences of Eastern Christianity.<sup>3</sup> Readers of Gibbon will recollect his sly allusion to the 'fortunate stumbling of the Emperor's horse.' Theodosius dies; Pulcheria and her 'nominal husband,' Marcian, ascend the Eastern throne; and Marcian writes to Leo as having 'oversight of, and ruling over, the divine faith,'<sup>4</sup> and offers a new council in which, *σοῦ αὐθεντοῦντος* (Lat. *te auctore*) peace may be settled among Catholic bishops.<sup>5</sup> These phrases by no means warrant the gloss that at the future synod Leo's authority should be all-decisive; and in the correspondence which followed we see clearly that when Leo intimated that he did

<sup>1</sup> *Epp.* 43 and 61. In referring to *Ep.* 44 Mr. Rivington makes Leo say that *he* is 'inspired divinely' in the sense of a special 'divine assistance, constituting Papal infallibility according to the Vatican decree' (p. 387). He complacently remarks that the phrase, 'if taken too strictly, goes beyond' that decree. But the Latin is '*fidei quam divinitus inspiratam et accepimus et tenemus*,' i.e. the faith as originally communicated by God to the Church, and so handed down to Leo. Mr. Rivington must have relied on an English quotation.

<sup>2</sup> It is the urgency of entreaty: 'Obsecramus—supplicant,' &c. As Bishop Andrewes says, 'Audis jam hic mandatum nullum.'—*Tort. Torti*, p. 196.

<sup>3</sup> When Mr. Rivington says, 'We know that' Theodosius 'had avowed the sovereignty of the see of St. Peter over all the sees of Christendom by his signature to the "constitution" of Valentinian,' *re Hilary* (p. 393), he forgets the imperial *usus loquendi*, which saved the principle of the unity of the empire by uniting the names of both emperors in the edicts of each. Cf. Marcian's letters, *Leon. Epp.* 100, 110 ('Valentinianus et Marcianus'), despatched in both names from Constantinople. Leo had 'obtained the "constitution" from Valentinian, who was then at Rome' (Tillemont, xv. 83), and it was sent off to Aetius, then ruling in Gaul. Theodosius's own conduct shows that he *could not* have committed himself to the 'constitution,' or acknowledged it as binding in the East.

<sup>4</sup> *Ep.* 73. Literally, 'having oversight and rule in regard to the divine faith' (not 'the bishop and ruler of' it). It must mean that Leo, as chief Christian bishop, was that faith's foremost guardian.

<sup>5</sup> The same phrase is used by Pulcheria in *Ep.* 77; Mr. Rivington quotes it (p. 392) and omits the accompanying words which contemplate a 'decision' by the expected Eastern council.



not want a new council, unless it was to be held in Italy, Marcian held to his resolution that a council should be held, and *not* in Italy, but near Constantinople. Leo had to make the best of it, though he did not conceal his annoyance: he could not use Marcian as he had used the wretched Valentinian. Even before Theodosius died, Leo had written to him about the new bishop of Constantinople, whom he had reason to regard with suspicion, and he wished his own Tome to be a test. Be it remembered that on Vatican principles, as Mr. Rivington expressly says (p. 415), the Tome '*was already of faith.*' Yet Leo speaks here with remarkable moderation: Anatolius should study the Fathers' writings, and with them Cyril's letter to Nestorius, and the minutes of the Ephesian Council; and '*let him not disdain to peruse my letter* also, which he will find to be in full accord with the pious mind of the Fathers.'<sup>1</sup> Can words be plainer as against the assertion that the Tome, *qua* Leo's, was infallible? No doubt, as to the bishops who had yielded to this tyranny of Dioscorus, Leo commissions Anatolius to act with his legates, and entrusts him with the carrying out of his *dispositio*<sup>2</sup>—a word which suggests the parenthetical hint, 'cf. the use of *dispositio* for an imperial edict,' so that Leo may be thus represented as nothing less than a spiritual Emperor, which, indeed, *is* the position assigned by authentic Roman teaching to his present namesake.

At the opening of the Council of Chalcedon, the legates objected to the presence of Dioscorus. Let us hear our author:

'The imperial commissioners wished to resist the decision of the legates [that he should have no seat in the council], but in vain. They had to obey "the head of all Churches," and cause Dioscorus

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 69. In *Ep.* 70, 'I ask that he will assent to Cyril's letter to Nestorius . . . *vel* epistolæ meæ,' &c. The Ballerini (naturally, from their standpoint) argue that *vel* here = *et*. But even taking it so, Cyril's letter and the Tome are put side by side; both are to be 'heedfully considered.' Is this like 'dealing with the archbishop of Constantinople as a subject, and imposing on him the Roman "form of faith"?' (p. 395). The circumstances fully account for the letter (of a year later) about two of Anatolius' priests, who had visited Rome and satisfied Leo of their orthodoxy (*Ep.* 87). But Mr. Rivington italicises 'by the teaching of the Holy Spirit,' as if Leo could not ascribe what 'he had learned and taught' to that Divine 'instruction' without assuming to be the infallible teacher of all Christians (p. 397). Cf. Leo, *Ep.* 120, from which Mr. Rivington (p. 415) quotes some words as to the contents of the Tome having been 'defined by God;' but further on Leo explains this by referring to the Scriptural authorities 'brought together in it,' as rendering 'further doubt' impossible.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* 85.

to leave his place. His presence, *however*, was required, and he was therefore allowed to sit without a seat as a constituent member, which was the gist of the legates' demand' (p. 401).

But Mr. Rivington omits (we are really weary of having so often to use this verb) the original insistence of the legates, 'Let him go out, or else we will go out;' and the remark of the commissioners, 'If you represent a judge, you must not be an accuser as well.' The arrangement came to was in the nature of a compromise;<sup>1</sup> but Dioscorus was treated as bishop of Alexandria until his final act of contumacy.<sup>2</sup> The title of 'Œcumenical Patriarch,' employed in the Alexandrian petitions to Leo as president, and to the council, was obviously put in to please Leo; and it must not be inferred from the council's silence that such a phrase received its sanction.<sup>3</sup> Again, when Dioscorus is condemned, the dictum of the legates, that Leo 'by them and by the council' deposed him, is by no means imitated in the successive votings of bishops.<sup>4</sup> A few combine Leo's name with that of Anatolius; still fewer combine it with the council's; a large number associate the names of both prelates with the council's; but the great majority refer to the council or 'the fathers' simply.

<sup>1</sup> See Mansi, vi. 581.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, in the third citation, Mansi, vi. 1036.

<sup>3</sup> If it did, then one might say that the council declared itself to be composed of angels; for three of these effusive memorialists address the council as 'your angelical company' (Mansi, vi. 1009, &c.; as does one of the bishops, *ib.* 1063). This sort of complimenting was not exclusively Eastern: Leo himself does not shrink from ascribing to emperors a 'sacerdotal energy' and 'a sacerdotal mind' (*Epp.* 24, 115, 155). Mr. Rivington's phrase, 'The term "universal bishop" . . . was freely used at the council of Chalcedon' (p. 438), would mislead an unwary reader.

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, vi. 1048 ff. The vote of the legates speaking first is assumed by Mr. Rivington to be the 'sentence' of the council (p. 405). In this he is following the Ballerini. True, the legates, as presiding, had repeatedly asked the council what was its mind as to the penalty merited by Dioscorus, and the council had replied that the penalty prescribed by 'the canons' should be inflicted. One Lydian bishop requested the legates, as presiding, to 'pronounce' accordingly, adding that the whole council was *συνήφρος* with them, a phrase repeated by the bishop of Antioch. Then the legates made their speech, which Tillemont calls their 'avis.' If it was the synodical sentence, why did it conclude by calling on the 'synod' to 'decide according to the canons'? and why was it followed by a series of episcopal pronouncements, among which the verbs 'decide' or 'define' occur some thirty times, and the verb 'judge' sixty-seven times, besides such terms as 'I condemn' or 'I exclude,' or 'I assent to the judgment pronounced by the fathers,' &c.? Where 'I think' occurs, it involves a judicial opinion or finding. In the subsequent signatures three legates, speaking as such, profess to 'define' (decide) 'together with the synod'; and three great prelates, speaking next, use the same phrase without alluding to Rome.

In the missives to Dioscorus and to his clergy, the sentence is grounded on his previous offences *plus* his contumacy towards the council; and instead of accepting, at the legates' suggestion, the position of being Leo's minister, the council repeatedly describes the deposition as its own act.<sup>1</sup> No doubt, in the letter to the emperor we read that Dioscorus might have been pardoned if he had not 'barked against the Apostolic see itself, and attempted to excommunicate Pope<sup>2</sup> Leo.' But Mr. Rivington stops just short of the momentous words, 'He has been fittingly deprived of his episcopate by the *Universal Council*.'<sup>3</sup>

And now as to the treatment of the Tome. The commissioners propose that the council should frame a doctrinal formulary. This is objected to, on the ground of the Ephesian council's 'rule' against compiling 'another Creed.' 'We cannot go beyond the expositions made by the Fathers'—meaning the Nicene and 'Constantinopolitan' forms of the Creed.<sup>4</sup> One bishop remarks, however, that Eutychianism has required some new statements of truth, that Leo has given a 'type' or formulary, and that 'we follow him and have signed his letter,' as, indeed, many bishops had done before the council met.<sup>5</sup> The bishops exclaim, 'We all say this; the expositions given are sufficient; it is not lawful to make another.' Clearly, 'this' refers to what they had said before; and Mr. Rivington ought to have recognised that the 'expositions' mean the Creed, and do not, as he assumes, include the Tome, for the Ephesian 'rule' would *not* have excluded any addition to documents like the Tome, which did not profess to be a Creed.<sup>6</sup> The remark that the council 'no more

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, vi. 1096, 1097. Twenty-two bishops refer to his contumacy; several to other offences.

<sup>2</sup> He is also twice in this context called 'archbishop,' a title which, like 'pope,' was applied by the Easterns to occupants of pre-eminent sees. One bishop in the same sentence prefixes 'pope' both to Leo and to Cyril (Mansi, vii. 21).

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, vi. 1099. *Because* the Council tells Pulcheria that 'Christ had used Leo as champion of the truth, as of old He used Peter,' *therefore*, according to Mr. Rivington's logic, the council declares Leo to be 'the Vicar of Christ in his direction of the Church—a statement which is correctly summed up in the more modern phrase, "Papal supremacy" or "infallibility"' (p. 408): Q. E. D.! In one passage, Mr. Rivington ventures to say that 'the invalidity of the Robber Synod was assigned by the bishops simply and solely to the decision of the bishop of Rome' (p. 435), as if it did not result from the proceedings *re* Dioscorus.

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, vi. 953.

<sup>5</sup> Anatolius and a synod had done so in the autumn of 450. Others signed later.

<sup>6</sup> See the 'rule' in Mansi, iv. 1361, against compiling *ἐκράν πρίστιν* beside the Nicene, or proposing it to converts.

sat in judgment on the Pope and St. Cyril, as superiors, than a man acts as superior to St. James and St. Paul' when he propounds a 'Harmonia Apostolica' (p. 411), is absolutely gratuitous. The Fourth Council did not 'judge' Cyril's teaching, because it had been solemnly adopted by the Third; but did it not, in any true sense, 'judge' Leo's? Let us see. The bishops at Ephesus, in their individual affirmations, had approved of Cyril's teaching as expressed in his second letter to Nestorius, *because* they 'found,' or 'ascertained,' or 'saw' it to be consonant to the Creed.<sup>1</sup> They thus erected it into a standard. It was so regarded when Leo's Tome was dealt with at Chalcedon. Now, here are some of the phrases in which the bishops adhere to a document proceeding from the Roman chair, and, according to Mr. Rivington, 'already of faith, irreversible' (p. 415), obligatory on all Christian consciences from the moment of its promulgation by Leo, simply because it was he who promulgated it: 'I have ascertained—I judge—I am fully persuaded—we find—we have found—that it is in accordance with the Creed,' and, as many bishops add, 'with the language of Cyril.' Or, 'as far as I have been able to perceive, or to understand, it agrees—I perceive that it no way differs—we have proved by examination that it no way differs—I find in it nothing divergent—I have found that it agrees—your Splendours [the commissioners] see that it agrees,' &c.<sup>2</sup> If words on a solemn occasion mean anything, here is a series of declarations in which individual bishops, members of the Œcumenical Council, accept the Tome *because* they personally believe it to be conformable to Church standards, just as their predecessors had dealt with Cyril's letter; and thus by their act it acquires a place among Church standards.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 1140, ff.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, vii. 9, ff. The last affirmation is by a bishop from Pontus, *ib.* 24.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Rivington rightly observes that the acclamation, 'Peter hath spoken [thus] by Leo' meant 'that as a matter of fact he was true to the Apostle's teaching.' But he adds, '*but* their exclamation suggests their belief that it followed from his official position' (p. 412). Rather, that he himself had spoken in a manner worthy of that position. Against this Roman Catholic of a few years' standing, who insists that the council had no option as to accepting the Tome, one may set a Pope, Vigilius, quoted in Bright's *Waymarks*, &c., p. 229. As Bossuet says (*Def. Decl. Cler. Gall.* vii. 17), 'placuit Leonis epistolam ad *legitimum concilii examen* revocare,' and he couples 'examen' with 'inquisitio' and 'judicium,' meaning that the bishops recorded the result of such 'examen,' that they had previously satisfied themselves of the soundness of the Tome. There is no parallel between this and Leo's offer in 458 to send clerics to explain the Chalcedonian teaching (*Ep.* 162); for in the same

The series, including the statements of those prelates who had found a few difficulties in the Tome (as if it tended to Nestorianism) and had been satisfied by explanations, extends (with the Latin rendering) over nearly thirty-seven columns of Mansi's seventh volume. Was it fair in Mr. Rivington to refrain from giving any samples of this language? We will ask another question: was it quite *prudent*?<sup>1</sup>

Coming to the 'Definitio Fidei' as ultimately adopted by the Council, Mr. Rivington makes the commissioners 'ask practically whether the bishops were prepared to withdraw themselves from the Supreme Pontiff' (p. 421). We need not say that there is nothing like 'Supreme Pontiff' in the original, which reads, 'from the most holy Leo,' a title by no means, in those days, equivalent to the 'Holy Father' among Roman Catholics.<sup>2</sup> Our author has a good right to emphasize the great service rendered by Leo's envoys in prevailing on the council to substitute '*in* two natures' for the ambiguous '*of* two natures,' which at first stood in the 'Definitio.' But the commissioners, in giving full support to this request, relied, not on any 'Papal prerogative,' but on the argument from consistency. By accepting the Tome, which pointedly affirmed that '*in* the complete nature of very Man was born very God, whole *in* what was His own, and whole *in* what was ours,' the Council had committed itself to '*in*.'<sup>3</sup> And the 'Definitio,' as revised and promulgated, has nothing of Papalism in it, and classes the Tome with Cyril's letter, '*inasmuch as* it is

letter, as elsewhere, he insists that this teaching is not open to revision (*Ep.* 162); whereas it is the merest *petitio principii* to assume that his Tome was in that position before the 'examen.'

<sup>1</sup> The speech of the legates is partly corrupt; but Mr. Rivington has misrepresented it. They do *not* 'describe the attitude of the synod towards the Tome of Leo as being precisely the same as their attitude towards the Council of Nice and the Council of Ephesus' (p. 414). On the contrary, they ground the claim of the Tome to acceptance on its agreement with the two forms of the Creed and with the Ephesine dogma (*Idoquē—καὶ τοῦτον ἡμῶν*, Mansi, vii. 11). That is, just when, on Mr. Rivington's showing, they ought to have proclaimed, in such language as was appropriate to their time, the principle of Papal infallibility, they, speaking for Leo, take up quite different ground. Mr. Rivington says of that principle, 'the thing was there' (p. 417). It was *not* there; it was conspicuous by its absence. Something else was there instead.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington tries to produce an effect by a free use of the phrases 'the Holy See,' 'His Holiness,' &c. Thus, in p. 337, 'Most Holy Father' appears with three initial capitals, while 'brother-minister' is not so distinguished. In p. 353 'your Holiness,' 'His Holiness,' are substituted for the original 'your Piety,' a common title of all bishops. These are little matters, but worth noting: we see what is aimed at.

<sup>3</sup> 'Therefore add to the definition,' &c. Mansi, vii. 105. See Leo, *Ep.* 28 (the Tome), c. 3, and '*in* both natures,' c. 5.

accordant with Peter's confession.'<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rivington mentions the address to Marcian, but slurs over a critical part of the case. The Council there defends the letter of 'the admirable prelate of Rome' from the charge of 'innovation' by precedents from earlier dogmatic letters, and then says, 'If it is *not* accordant with the Scriptures, or with previous Fathers, let them prove that it is not.'<sup>2</sup>

Theodoret's case is strangely treated by our author. He makes the great theologian-bishop, in appealing from the Latrocinium to Leo, ascribe to 'the Apostolic throne superabundant splendour, presidency over the whole world, abundance of subjects, present rule, and the communication of her name to her subjects' (p. 427). Will it be believed that Mr. Rivington is here (and in p. 33) transferring to the *see* of Rome, at the sacrifice of sense, what Theodoret says of the *city*?<sup>3</sup> It is the city, too, which in the next words is described as 'chiefly adorned by its faith, and by the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul.' These advantages, no doubt, reflect upon the see; it is called the see of the two Apostles, and is said to have received new honour through the orthodox zeal of its present occupant; and Theodoret unquestionably uses the technical term *ἐπικαλουμένῳ* in this application for Leo's help, and undertakes to abide by Leo's judgment, whatever it may be. But in the letter to the Roman priest Renatus<sup>4</sup> (of whose death he was not aware), he hopes that the 'archbishop' of Rome will bid him take refuge with 'your council,' and promises to accept what 'you' (*ὑμῶν*) may decide. This 'council,' Mr. Rivington insists, would be the mere 'machinery'

<sup>1</sup> 'With which letter [of Cyril] the Council has *reasonably combined* the letter of . . . Archbishop Leo,' &c. Mansi, vii. 113. Routh, *Scr. Opusc.* ii. 78.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, vii. 465. Marcian is asked to 'confirm by the synod the teaching of the see of Peter'; and sixteen passages from Fathers are added, in defence of its theology from the charge of 'innovation.' Yet, according to Mr. Rivington, it was *de fide* from the first!

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Rivington also represents Theodoret as saying that this see, as compared with others, has 'abundance of spiritual gifts'; whereas the original makes a contrast between 'some *cities* which are large, beautiful, or populous, and others which, lacking those qualities, are made splendid by some spiritual gifts' (Theod. *Ep.* 113). 'Subjects,' too, is a right rendering in the second instance; in the first it should be 'inhabitants.' Now, either Mr. Rivington had read the passage which he professes to represent in English, or he had not. We hope he had not. But then what right had he to deal with it?

<sup>4</sup> In this letter the Roman see is said to have 'on many accounts the presidency, *τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*, over all Churches.' Mr. Rivington mistranslates this by his favourite 'sovereignty,' and does not appreciate the significance of the chief reason assigned—the fidelity of its occupants to the truth.



of the purely 'Papal judgment'; but in another letter 'Anatolius' (not the bishop, as our author hastily assumes, but a 'patrician' to whom Theodoret wrote seven letters) is asked to obtain leave for Theodoret to 'go to the West and be judged by the bishops who dwell in it';<sup>1</sup> so that the council was somehow to represent the Western Church, which a bishop wronged in the East would naturally wish to enlist on his side. As Theodoret must have expected, Leo, and doubtless some assembly of Westerns, pronounced in his favour. This, on Vaticanist principles, should have been amply sufficient to place him, as a matter of course, among the constituent members of the Council of Chalcedon. But it was by no means deemed sufficient. The commissioners found that, in face of strong opposition, he could only take his seat in the midst as a competent accuser capable also of being accused. He did not vote, 'except on such business as was connected with his own justification,' *i.e.* as was properly doctrinal.<sup>2</sup> In the eighth session he was called upon explicitly to anathematize Nestorius. Mr. Rivington (applying the Vatican 'principles') thinks that this did not prejudice the previous Roman judgment, chiefly because the legates themselves ultimately gave the synodical decision in his favour (p. 432). But the fact remains that the bishops vehemently and persistently imposed on him a test which Leo had not imposed; that he tried to satisfy them by something short of it; that he was not pronounced 'worthy of his see' until he submitted.<sup>3</sup> The legates did *not* 'give the decision,' but simply took the lead in giving a vote; bishops followed, none of them referring to Leo's action;<sup>4</sup> then all the prelates assented by acclamation, and the commissioners pronounced that Theodoret 'should regain the church of Cyros, according to the judgment of the council'—words not exhibited by our author.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Tois év ἐκείνῃ*, *Ep.* 119. Tillemont says, 'Although Theodoret, in writing to the Pope, speaks as if he had addressed him alone, we see that it was from the bishops of the West in general that he awaited the decision of his cause' (xv. 294). The letter to Florentius (*Ep.* 117) is considered by Tillemont to be a circular to these bishops. Mr. Rivington cannot have looked at the very address of *Ep.* 119, 'To Anatolius the patrician.' On the term see Gibbon, ii. 309.

<sup>2</sup> See Tillemont, xv. 308.

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, vi. 589; vii. 188.

<sup>4</sup> Maximus of Antioch said he had long known Theodoret to be orthodox—because he had heard his preaching (Mansi, vii. 192).

<sup>5</sup> Mansi, vii. 189 ff. Two other cases may be touched on in a note. Domnus of Antioch had been deposed at the Latrocinium, and Maximus had been consecrated in his place. If all the Latrocinian acts were invalidated, Maximus could not be bishop of Antioch; but Leo had pronounced in his favour, and Mr. Rivington holds that this pronouncement



Lastly, as to the twenty-eighth canon. Mr. Rivington moralizes (in a manner which suggests some reflections) on the 'lust of power' which possessed the see of Constantinople. This passion, it seems, is very 'infectious in an imperial centre.' Not at all, we suppose, in a centre which emperors had left open to Popes! But to proceed. The see of the Eastern capital, says our author, 'wished to be in the East what Rome was as patriarch of the West. Πατριάρχιας κληροῦσθε was St. Gregory of Nazianzus's condemnation of the East.' The words, in his autobiographical poem, have nothing to do with technical patriarchates; they refer (as Mr. Rivington would have seen had he looked them up) to ambitious prelates who wanted promotion to grander sees.<sup>1</sup> As for the 'rebuffs which Constantinople had met with' at Chalcedon, the council had not refused to call the 'Sojourning Synod' a synod, but had simply blamed it for condemning a bishop unheard;<sup>2</sup> and when it declined to sanction Constantinople's custom in one particular, the commissioners added that its claim 'should be considered in due order at the council.'<sup>3</sup> The Roman legates were present, so that they were the sole ground on which Maximus was recognized at Chalcedon, and that the case 'covers everything ever claimed by the Holy See in the way of jurisdiction,' so that in recognizing Maximus the council admitted that 'the government of the Church was strictly and properly Papal' (p. 434). But Maximus had already approved himself orthodox by circulars 'throughout his provinces' (Leo, *Ep.* 88. 3); so that the council, in accepting him from the outset as bishop of Antioch, had not merely Leo's act to rest upon; and in the tenth session Stephen of Ephesus spoke of his appointment as originally 'canonical,' on the ground, apparently, that Domnus had waived his own rights (Mansi, vii. 260). As for Juvenal of Jerusalem, the approval of a compromise between him and Maximus, about jurisdictions, was the act of the council itself, in the seventh session. The salvo by which, according to Mr. Rivington, Maximus referred to Leo's sanction, is not in the Greek Acts (Mansi, vii. 180); and the legates' speech, even in the version relied on by our author, ignores it (cf. Migne's *Leo*, ii. col. 731); nor does Leo mention it in his letter of 453. Mr. Rivington applies his words 'in hac sollicitudine' to that question; but Leo is speaking of the maintenance of the faith, and it is immediately afterwards that he urges Maximus to uphold the 'privileges' of Antioch, and to 'consult' with him for that end. He is writing two years after the council (a point overlooked by our author); and he does not speak as he must have spoken if such a salvo had been referred to him; he only says that he has not sanctioned any act of his legates on matters not doctrinal. He does mention Juvenal's earlier 'attempts' made in 431 (*Ep.* 119).

<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere, *Orat.* 42. 23, Gregory uses 'patriarchs' for senior bishops. At Chalcedon the commissioners extend it to all primates or exarchs (Mansi, vi. 953).

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, vii. 92. The 'Sojourning Synod' grew up out of natural relations between the bishop of Constantinople and bishops visiting that capital on their own Church affairs.

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, vii. 313.

and any Eastern prelates interested had fair warning.<sup>1</sup> There was nothing like stealing a march or springing a mine. When, at the close of the next day's session, Aetius, the archdeacon of Constantinople, announced that his Church had some business to bring forward, the commissioners 'directed the council to examine it' without their presence,<sup>2</sup> but the legates said that 'they had no instructions about such a matter.' Their game (if such a phrase may be used) was obvious: they wanted to avoid being outvoted, and afterwards to come in and protest against what might have been resolved upon in their absence; but, as Mr. Rivington says, 'it turned out that they *had* also received orders from Rome to oppose any attempt at altering the relations of bishops on the ground of the civil status of their sees' (p. 442). He means that on the next day, a legate, on being challenged, produced some instructions from Leo to that effect. Their former reply, then, was a falsehood which had served its purpose. However, the council could not have its action stopped by the withdrawal of those who professed to be its presidents; and the canon ranked as twenty-eighth was passed in a form which afterwards received a not unimportant modification. Unquestionably, there was more of ingeniousness than of ingenuousness in the wording, which endeavoured to make the newly-sanctioned patriarchal jurisdiction in the 'Asiatic,' Pontic, and Thracian *dioceses* (*i.e.* aggregates of provinces), a logical consequence of the precedence conferred on Constantinople in 381.<sup>3</sup> We hold no brief for the see of the Eastern capital; its prelates and clergy were just as open to the temptation of self-aggrandisement as those of Rome: but three points must in fairness be remembered: first, between 381 and 451 Constantinople had been practically allowed in several cases to exercise authority in Asia; secondly, the ninth and seventeenth canons of this very council had allowed an appeal from primates<sup>4</sup> in Asia Minor to 'the see of Constantinople'; thirdly, 'Rome herself,' in Tillemont's phrase, 'was probably a cause of this canon which she opposed so strongly,' for some dissatisfaction at 'the legates' presidency' appears to

<sup>1</sup> Anatolius told Leo that he had 'often informed them about this very matter.' Leon. *Ep.* 101.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington's statement that they 'refused' to attend (p. 442) gives a very false impression. Contrast Hefele: 'The commissioners . . . had commanded the synod to take the matter into their consideration' (s. 201; cf. s. 200).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bright, *Notes on the Canons*, p. 222.

<sup>4</sup> We have already given a brilliant specimen of Papal exegesis in regard to the ninth canon (*supra*, Part I. p. 18).

have been exhibited in the council, and it may well be 'that the Easterns were glad to augment the power of Constantinople, as being most likely to hinder that of Rome from raising itself higher and higher';<sup>1</sup> so that thus 'the canons passed with the consent even of the principal bishops of Asia,' and several bishops present abstained from voting, but apparently did not oppose.<sup>2</sup> Next day both commissioners and legates reappeared: the former asked for an explanation of what was said to have been done. The new canon was accordingly read, whereupon one legate, with a truly Roman intrepidity of assertion as to what had taken place in his absence, affirmed that the signatures had been given under constraint. It does not in the least surprise us that, in spite of the evidence that 'the bishops exclaimed, "No one was forced,"' that the commissioners expressly asked the 'Asian and Pontic' signatories whether they had signed of their own free will, that thirteen successively replied in the affirmative, and that 'the rest exclaimed, "We signed voluntarily,"' Mr. Rivington (without evidence) restricts the disclaimer of coercion to 'some few,' thinks the assertion of the legate 'probable,' and gravely adduces in its favour the 'fearless' assertion of Leo to the same effect (pp. 443, 447), as if Leo would hesitate about repeating 'fearlessly' whatever his legates reported to him on such a matter.<sup>3</sup> But now see how Mr. Rivington deals with the Acts when they speak of a reading of certain

<sup>1</sup> Tillemont, xv. 710. Mr. Rivington calls a statement to this effect 'strange' when made by Mr. Gore, who, however, was simply following Tillemont. But we know what Mr. Rivington thinks of the great Gallican. As Tillemont fairly remarks, Ephesus was vacant, and the primate of Cappadocia did not sign.

<sup>2</sup> The number of signatories present was short of 200, whereas in the case of the Tome it was over 330; in the case of Dioscorus under 300; but, as Mr. Rivington remarks, several bishops had left Chalcedon. It is observable that Theodoret signed.

<sup>3</sup> So before, when the third canon of Constantinople is to be disparaged, we are told of Leo's 'determined accuracy' in calling it only the decree of "certain" bishops' (p. 258). This very accurate Pontiff averred, in the same passage, that this canon had 'long ago collapsed' (*Ep.* 106). 'He could have known but little of what had taken place in the East' (Tillemont, xv. 701). Wishes were apt to make facts for Leo. See above, as to the 'Sardican' canon being called 'Nicene,' and the 'constitution' of Valentinian. Again, the Acts represent the legates, in their pronouncement as to Dioscorus, as calling Leo the 'archbishop of the great and elder Rome.' Leo himself, in 452, writing to the Gallic bishops, and professing to give the legates' words, makes them describe him not only as 'papa,' but as '*caput universalis ecclesiae*' (*Ep.* 103), a phrase which, to say the least, looks very like a Papal addition to words used at Chalcedon. It may have been what the legates reported to Leo; but he would see no harm in 'correcting defects' in their language.

earlier canons. 'The legates read the sixth canon of Nicæa, . . . quoted the sixth Nicene canon, beginning, "Rome has always held the primacy"' (pp. 443 ff.).<sup>1</sup> Here, let us remark in passing, it is clearly intended to prepossess the reader in favour of the genuineness of what they read. But 'Aetius is then *supposed* to have read first a *slightly different* version of the same canon, and then the third of Constantinople.' (It was not Aetius, but Constantine, an imperial secretary.) 'But this is in the highest degree improbable,' because the Nicene canon could not throw light on the claims of the see of Constantinople, which was then only the see of Byzantium, and the church of Constantinople now relied on the third canon of Constantinople, the Nicene canon being its 'difficulty.'<sup>2</sup> But if it was *ad rem* for a legate to quote his version of a Nicene canon, why was it irrelevant for a Constantinopolitan to read its Greek text? Then as to the 'slight difference': Mr. Rivington does not give the Latin version here in parallelism with the Greek; but he more than suggests (as he had done before) that the Latin represents the true text, and therefore that the Greek was at least erroneous. He relies on a subsequent speech by the commissioners, that they 'perceived that by the canons the first place (τὰ πρωτεία) and the pre-eminent honour were reserved for the archbishop of Old Rome.'<sup>3</sup> But so they were, in effect, by the third canon of Constantinople; and the commissioners at once go on, '*but* that the archbishop of New Rome ought to enjoy the same privileges of honour' (meaning, ought to enjoy a precedency next after Rome's, yet resembling it); and they propose some changes in the wording of the canon, intended to safeguard the rights of local churches. But we have already said enough about the legates' Latin version, and we are past being surprised at finding that 'the legates' protest,' at the end of the proceedings, is given (p. 446) without the commissioners'

<sup>1</sup> This commencement is called by Van Espen the *character specialissimus* of the Roman codex of the canons (*Opp.* iii. 14, ed. 1753).

<sup>2</sup> So in p. 171: 'The occurrence of this sixth canon in what the archdeacon of Constantinople is *supposed* to have read is probably due to the copyists.' Here, no doubt, Mr. Rivington follows Hefele and the Ballerini. But if the legates' version of the canon was alone read, then the Greek text was practically thrown overboard by the church of Constantinople at the very moment at which its exhibition would have been necessary in order to prove that it *was* the text. It would be more consistent to suppose, as Mr. Rivington does, but as Hefele does not, that the 'Greek text' was spurious; but that view is against Greek authorities and two Latin versions.

<sup>3</sup> This was to conciliate the legates: and apart from all question about canons, Rome's position as the 'first' see was indisputable.

humiliating rebuff: 'All that we have proposed' has been sanctioned by the whole council.'

Yet the letter of the council to Leo is claimed by Mr. Rivington as recognizing to the full his universal supremacy, and therefore as nullifying 'the Anglican interpretation' of the canon which was thus enacted in the teeth of his legates' protest. Now, first, the canon must be taken in its grammatical sense, and not explained away on the score of any expressions in the letter. Then look at the expressions:<sup>2</sup> the bishops call Leo their 'head,' because by his legates he was their president, and, as first among bishops, might fairly be addressed as their 'father.' He had 'held the position of interpreting the words of St. Peter,' inasmuch as they had accepted his Tome expressly on the ground that it truly represented the purport of Matt. xvi. 16; and by publicly affirming the true faith they had 'used him as an originator of what was good.' 'To him had been committed by the Saviour the guardianship of the Vine': to him conspicuously and eminently, as holding a primary place, but certainly not in a sense generically unique; for they themselves had 'received authority both to root up and to plant,' and they treated the 'definition' as their own. They requested him to 'honour the decision by adding his own vote' (*ψήφοις*), and so to 'confirm and assent to' what had been done by 'the Œcumenical Council' and, as they do not shrink from adding, 'under the guidance of a Divine command'; and accordingly they 'make known to him the whole purport (*δύναμιν*) of their proceedings,' which Mr. Rivington mistakes for an 'express statement that "the force of all" rests with his confirmation and ordering.'<sup>3</sup> Our author has thus exaggerated in the Papal interest the force of language which is otherwise sufficiently explained, especially by the light of acts which say more than words. Mr. Rivington himself would not deny that Oriental fluency of 'compliment' appears in that curious passage which assumes that the legates only resisted the new canon that Leo might have the pleasure of approving it.

<sup>1</sup> *Διεδάλῃσμεν, interlocuti sumus.* Hefele explains, 'The prerogative assigned to the church of Constantinople is, in spite of the opposition of the Roman legate, decreed by the synod' (not, as our author says, by a 'little knot of bishops'). Πάντα is evidently a mistake for πάντα—see the Latin version (Mansi, vii. 454).

<sup>2</sup> Leon. *Ep.* 98.

<sup>3</sup> Πᾶσαν ὑμῖν τῶν πεπραγμένων τὴν δύναμιν ἐγνωρίσαμεν εἰς . . . βεβαίωσιν τε καὶ συγκατάθεσιν. Our readers will see how Mr. Rivington has here mishandled the Greek. It was Anatolius who said what is thus erroneously ascribed to the council; but, as Mr. Rivington puts it, he said it 'later on' (p. 457). Yes, more than two years later (Leon. *Ep.* 132. 4).

Was it not, also, intelligible and inevitable that Leo, as president, should be asked to confirm a canon which, although it did not interfere with his own patriarchate or with Western Church administration, and therefore had no relation to Western Church law, did expressly mention his see, and expressly assign a cause for the 'privileges' which had been 'given' to it? Then as to Anatolius' letter: it says that the council was summoned to 'confirm the faith of the fathers and the letter of Leo';<sup>1</sup> but Mr. Rivington himself knows how to put different senses on 'confirming,' and the synod had met, by imperial order, to secure the right faith, of which Anatolius could truly say that Leo's letter was in full 'accord' with it. But, we repeat, the Acts of the Council show an essential difference between the treatment of the Creed and the treatment of the Tome; and if, as Anatolius says, the bishops 'laid on the altar their definition drafted for the confirmation of the fathers' faith, in accordance with' the Tome, he means that the Tome was solemnly approved as a true expression of that faith. Anatolius quotes the authoritative statement of the commissioners, that 'the *ōpos*' (meaning here the canon) 'of the holy Council' <sup>2</sup> was established'; and it is *honoris gratia*, as the Latin version puts it, that Leo is requested to give it his 'approval and confirmation.' And, lastly, as to Leo's letter on the subject, Mr. Rivington had formerly made him by implication the Church's 'Emperor'; he now explicitly makes him the Church's 'King,'<sup>3</sup> but he will not admit what is implied in the particular line of objection which Leo through many letters takes up and maintains. No doubt, in these 'majestic and tender' epistles, he reiterates such dulcet terms as *ambitio*, *improbi desiderii*, *illicito appetitu*, *illicitos excessus*, *intemperanti cupidini*, *prava cupiditas*, and assumes that Anatolius gained his point *extortis assentationibus*, &c. But although his real animus may be discerned through this copious vituperation, he never takes up a properly Papal ground of objection: <sup>4</sup> he poses, throughout,

<sup>1</sup> Leon. *Ep.* 101.

<sup>2</sup> He charges the legates with 'disturbing the synod.'

<sup>3</sup> 'As it is the duty of a king . . . so Leo' (p. 460).

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Rivington notices this objection on p. 182 (where, however, the third canon of Constantinople seems to be named by oversight for the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon), and meets it by one of his Papalist assumptions. Canons 'were not a hyper-Papal power, ruling the Popes themselves, for they acquired their force from the Popes.' Then come two illustrations: (1) A king is bound to respect the laws—'not because they are superior to him, but because he is bound by the natural and divine law to set the example.' Has submission to ecclesiastical absolutism made Mr. Rivington forget the traditions, the basal ideas, of king-



as the champion of Nicene rules, as guarding the interest of Alexandria and Antioch, of 'provincial primacies,' of the privileges of metropolitical sees.<sup>1</sup> He was a statesman, and, so far, a diplomatist: he is addressing, not his own Western, but an Eastern emperor and Eastern ecclesiastics; and in so doing he forbears to rest on the Papal claim as such, and falls back on the lower but safer line which might have been taken up by an Egyptian or Syrian prelate who looked with jealousy on Constantinople.<sup>2</sup> The inference is too obvious to need statement; nor shall we dwell on the fact summarised by Tillemont after Liberatus, that 'ce canon subsista et fut exécuté, malgré l'opposition de S. Léon et de ses successeurs, parce que les empereurs l'appuyoient.'<sup>3</sup>

In his 'Conclusion' (p. 461) Mr. Rivington professes to give us 'the verdict of history.' Does this phrase come well from one for whom the 'verdict' has been dictated before the professed inquiry has commenced? and is it usual to give a verdict before the evidence has been judicially summarized? Of

ship as understood by Englishmen? He may consult a Roman Catholic historian: it was part of Richard II.'s despotic policy to 'place himself above the control of the law' (Lingard, *H. Engl.* iv. 255; cf. *K. Rich. II.* ii. 1, 'Thy state of law is bondsman to the law.') (2) The relation of Pope to canons is compared with that of Roman emperors to law: i.e. the Pope is more than the king: he is the autocrat of the Church! (So, indeed, Vaticanism makes him; see Mr. Gladstone's *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*, p. 99.) But in this case Leo keeps his supposed kingship, or emperorship, in the background. By the way, if the Pope *has* this position, how can Mr. Rivington venture to say that for Sylvester to have 'sent an authoritative utterance,' imposing 'the Homocousios' (usually spoken of as 'Homocousion') on the East, as 'a condition of Catholic communion,' would have been the 'despotic method' (p. 158)? It would have been strictly within the terms of the Vatican decree.

<sup>1</sup> *Epp.* 104, 105, 106.

<sup>2</sup> A bishop (Eusebius) assured the Council of Chalcedon that, when at Rome, he had read the third canon of Constantinople to Leo, who had approved of it (Mansi, vii. 449). 'It is not easy,' says Tillemont, 'to harmonize this with what St. Leo afterwards asserted, that the Roman church had never given its approval to this canon' (xv. 617). The bishop (who was an impetuous person) most likely misunderstood Leo's silence, pretty much as Mr. Rivington has misconstrued the silence of Easterns in certain circumstances. In the very first session of Chalcedon the legates had recognized Anatolius as ranking next to Leo (Mansi, vi. 607).

<sup>3</sup> Liberatus, *Brev.* c. 13; Tillemont, xv. 715, 730; see also Hefele, s. 207. The Greeks, although for a time they 'seemed' to yield, ultimately secured what the canon gave them, and reaffirmed the canon at the Council 'in Trullo.' At last even the fourth Council of Lateran, professing to 'renew the ancient privileges of patriarchal sees,' recognized Constantinople as ranking second after Rome as supreme (Mansi, xxii. 989).

this process there could not be, and there is not, a single trace in our author's volume. His readers soon learn what they have to expect: there is very little relief from the tedious monotony of unproved assumption, unwarranted gloss, and undisguised special pleading. In saying this, we do not for a moment doubt that every line has been written under a sense of duty—we mean, of religious obligation—but the Roman spirit, when it dominates a writer who is himself a recent proselyte, absorbs all other considerations into the supreme necessity of making out, *quocunque modo*, a case for Rome, and, we can well believe, does not allow the question of strict controversial fairness practically to present itself. Judging by the work before us, we could imagine that spirit as saying to such a writer, '*Hæ tibi erunt artes, Romane*. No facts in regard to Church history can be for you so certain as is the view of it imposed on the faithful in the Vatican decree of Pius IX. You will therefore read that view into all your documents. You will assume it as in possession of the ground, and throw on opponents the task of proving its absence. Whatever seems to make for it, you will amplify; whatever seems to make against it, you will minimize, or explain away, or ignore. Such words or acts as imply deference you will strain into pledges of submission; such as point rather to independence you will slur over or disparage. Loyalty to Rome will determine how much of a passage or a sentence should be quoted in the text; or how far the reader is to be enabled by footnotes to refer to authorities and to judge of your accuracy. You will deal largely in assertion, and in reiteration of what has been asserted; you will not be afraid of paradox, in maintaining the genuineness of what has usually been deemed spurious, or the spuriousness of what has usually been deemed genuine. You will uphold the majesty of the Holy See by an air of superb confidence; you will apply to the defence of Papal authority the watchword of a great revolutionist, "*De l'audace, encore de l'audace, toujours de l'audace!*" Such "boldness" suits the Roman genius, and is traditional with those who have best understood Rome.'

Our 'verdict,' then, on this bold attempt to Vaticanize antiquity must be given with that sincere regret which is due to Mr. Rivington's former and unforgotten services in the promotion of Christian piety, but which cannot be allowed to bar judgment where interests so serious are concerned. The thing furthest from our intention would be to do him any injustice; and we do not care to dwell on specimens of lax scholarship or false logic, or on the recurrence of references taken at second

hand or misunderstood—a sure evidence of superficiality, of what may be called unreal knowledge. Such things might be complained of on literary grounds, if it were worth while. But graver issues are raised by a publication which is obviously part of a new Roman campaign against the English Church and the Churches in communion with her. We are bound to speak plainly of the most untrustworthy presentation of a great period of history which has ever come under our notice; we understand the influences which have determined its character; and our conviction is that, so far from attracting any thoughtful Anglicans to Papalism, it will but confirm their antagonism to a system which employs—and requires—such methods of support.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

Since this second article on Mr. Rivington's volume was in type, a pamphlet has appeared entitled '*Primitive and Roman: a Reply to the Church Quarterly Review*, by the Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A. (London, 1894).' In proceeding to notice it, we pass over sundry personalities, which are, to say the least, somewhat unconventional, and which have nothing to do with argument; and, premising that those who compare it with our first article will see how many points it passes over, we come to the first topic, the alleged necessity of a visible head for the Church as a visible body. Here, to begin with, *dolus latet* in undefined terms: in one sense there be 'heads' many, from the Tsar of Russia to the chairman *pro tempore* of a society's meeting. But no 'head' will suit the contention of Cardinal Vaughan<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Rivington but one whose power is absolute, whose will determines all the action of the 'body,' and without whom the 'body' is merely

<sup>1</sup> We had animadverted on the Cardinal's language about the late Dr. Littledale. Mr. Rivington, with his wonted recklessness of parallelism, tries to match it by some words of Dr. Littledale's (as too often, without giving the reference—*Petrine Claims*, p. 181) to the effect that Eusebius might be compared to Burnet for '*even wilful inaccuracy*.' If Dr. Littledale, or any other writer, Roman or Anglican, had said that the works of Eusebius or of Burnet '*were written in order to blind and mislead, made up of calumnies, misquotations, and a calculated admixture of truth and error*,' we should say that he had committed a moral offence. But thorough-going Papalist writers would do well to avoid the subject of 'misquotations.' The Cardinal's recent utterances (see his second letter to the Archbishop of Toledo on the Cabrera matter) are much more Christian-like in tone; but if he imagines that a 'multitude of Anglicans' agree with Rome on 'nearly' all points except the Papacy, his powers of self-persuasion must be unique. Those for whom this *Review* may speak are deliberately opposed to Rome on various grounds, theological, historical, and, last but not least, moral.

a lifeless 'trunk'; and to maintain the necessity of such a 'head' for every 'body corporate' would be too desperate a proceeding. The Eastern Church, however schismatical in their eyes, is as truly a body as the Latin Church itself; and she flatly contradicts the above postulate by affirming that the Church has no visible head at all, and reserving the title of Head for the Lord in heaven.<sup>1</sup> True, Mr. Rivington ventures to claim St. Paul on the ground of '1 Cor. xii. 15' (it should be 21):<sup>2</sup> on which we observe, that to apply the whole imagery of a human body in detail would involve strange results; that if St. Paul had looked on St. Peter as the 'head,' he would not have left a point so momentous to be inferred from one clause in an illustration in which the head is simply classed with feet, eye, and hands; that in this same letter the name of Cephas has appeared in collocation with his own, and no hint given of any difference in authority; and that, soon after writing 1 Cor., he ranked Cephas, as a pillar, with 'James and John,' and told the Galatians how he had once 'withstood Cephas to the face, because he stood condemned.' St. Paul does speak repeatedly and emphatically of Christ as the 'Head' of the 'body'; and if he had believed St. Peter to be the visible head, as representing Christ in a unique sense, it would have deeply concerned him to state this belief in one or other of the three great contexts, Eph. iv. 15, Col. i. 18, ii. 19.<sup>3</sup> In fact, this Roman argument obscures a leading feature of Christian supernaturalism; it assumes that the visible Church is a body complete in itself, like any temporal society; whereas it is but the smaller part of a great whole, which extends through the worlds seen and unseen, but has its true vital centre in the invisibly present Christ.

Then as to the Epistle of Clement: the suppression of his name, says our author, was 'more natural on the Papal theory than the episcopal.' Why? How can he assume that at the end of the first century the Church of Rome was

<sup>1</sup> The Eastern Church is under four patriarchs and the 'holy synod' of Russia. This is something like a 'board.'

<sup>2</sup> Our readers shall see his very words. 'It seems that to St. Paul it was a matter of necessity that in the visible Church there should be a visible head;' and he implies that this head, thus recognized by St. Paul, must be St. Peter (p. 6). It will be observed that in St. Paul's context the illustration of interdependence by the members of a human body runs through seven verses before 'the head' is referred to; and see ver. 22. Further, when the illustration is finished he says, 'And God hath set some in the Church: first, *apostles*,' in the plural.

<sup>3</sup> The argument from silence, therefore, is *here* valid; and we should also apply it to the case of the great circular letter called the first Epistle of St. Peter.

understood—say, at Corinth—to be a mere ‘*modus loquendi*’ for the bishop of Rome,’ and for him as *Pope*? And if, ‘according to Roman teaching, the power lies formally in the bishop’—which must here mean the bishop of Rome, the Pope—‘but radically in the Church,’ we think we know to whom such a statement will give an advantage. Mr. Rivington is sadly addicted to false analogies. His argument from Archbishop Benson’s use of ‘the court’ in his Lincoln judgment, as meaning ‘himself,’ quietly assumes the point to be proved, that the Roman Church was but the sphere of the Pope’s universally sovereign action. Anyone who reads the epistle will see that what is pressed on Corinth is not any jurisdiction as belonging to Rome, but Rome’s strong moral *auctoritas*. Mr. Rivington here retorts on us the charge of reading ‘preconceptions’ into evidence. We reply that we are simply taking the letter as it stands, and declining to let the Papal theory be assumed as determining its import.<sup>1</sup>

Then as to ‘the Roman episcopate of St. Peter’: ‘Records or no records’—*i.e.* whether there be or be not documentary evidence for the alleged fact—it is ‘certain,’ says our author dogmatically, ‘in the court of sound logic,’ because of ‘the words of Scripture appointing St. Peter to be the head of the Church under Christ’; because the Roman Church has constantly affirmed that he was to be an ‘enduring foundation of unity’; because no other see has ever claimed a Petrine succession. Now, first, there are no such ‘words of Scripture’; secondly, if they existed, they would prove nothing about a ‘Roman episcopate’; thirdly, the Roman affirmation referred to, whatever it means, would not prove the fact; fourthly, the greatest of the Popes, Gregory I., expressly speaks of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch as forming a triple Petrine see.<sup>2</sup> Next comes another pretended parallelism between ‘the absence of contemporary records’ in the case of Gautama Buddha and his life in India in the sixth century B.C., and such absence as to the Roman episcopate of an apostle whom St. Paul mentions as a colleague, and who was a writer in

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rivington says that the epistle of St. Clement was written in consequence of ‘the deposition of a bishop or bishops’ at Corinth. Certainly more than one person had been irregularly ejected (§ 44); and although Clement implies the existence of a higher order than the presbyters, it was against them that the sedition had been stirred up. On Clement’s position at Rome see Gore on *The Ministry*, p. 324 (1st edit.).

<sup>2</sup> *Epist.* vii. 40, viii. 2. Antioch claimed to be a Petrine ‘Apostolic throne’ (see Maximus at Chalcedon, Mansi, vii. 180, and Neale, *Patriarchate of Antioch*, pp. 153, 210, &c.); and Theodoret speaks of the ‘Apostolic throne’ of Alexandria, *Ep.* 83. See also Mr. Rivington’s *Prim. Ch. and See of Peter*, p. 166, ‘the three sees of Peter.’

Nero's reign. Mr. Rivington quotes Bishop Pearson as having referred to 'this Roman episcopate of the Apostle' as a fact which 'in the primitive Church was . . . looked upon as a real and indubitable truth.' Here he refers correctly to Pearson's *Minor Works*, ii. 323 (though 'c. vi.' should be explained by '*Dissert. i.*'), but he gives a twist to the passage, for Pearson is speaking of the question whether the first bishop of Rome had '*aliquem ex apostolis auctorem et antecessorem*,' and goes on to say that Irenæus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius deduce the Roman succession from Peter and Paul.<sup>1</sup> Irenæus and Tertullian, as we have shown, do not reckon any apostle among the bishops of Rome; and it is this lack of evidence in the second century for 'the Petrine episcopate' which makes it necessary to account, as we have proposed to account, for the subsequent upgrowth of the story. Nor is it beyond doubt that Eusebius 'witnesses to' the Petrine episcopate. When compared with the *History*, the passage in the present versions of the *Chronicle* is not above suspicion. No doubt he quotes in his *History* (v. 6) the famous passage in St. Irenæus; but never in the *History* does he say or imply that Peter had himself been bishop of Rome. And as to St. Irenæus, the 'verb' which he uses does *not* suggest that what 'the Apostles handed over to Linus' was an office already in existence at Rome. Mr. Rivington is thinking of the Latin *tradiderunt*; but that word would not establish his point, and Irenæus's own 'verb' is ἐνεχρίσθαι, the same verb used by St. Chrysostom as to the appointment of St. James to the see of Jerusalem, of which confessedly he was the first occupant.<sup>2</sup> In the same page Mr. Rivington contends that even if St. Peter did not actually sit as bishop at Rome, he might still have devolved his 'primacy' on 'that see.' Now (1) 'primacy' is an illusory term, when autocratic sovereignty is meant; (2) there is no evidence in the New Testament that such precedence or eminence as St. Peter held among the apostles was transmissible; (3) if he was not bishop of Rome, if the Roman see had not really been *his* seat, a large part of the language in patristic writings about that see must be discounted as based on a mistake.

Then as to 'third or eighth bishop from the Apostles,' in Irenæus, Mr. Rivington (borrowing from Dom Cuthbert Butler) calmly remarks, 'If I say that Henry I. was the second king from the Conqueror, I do not exclude the Conqueror from

<sup>1</sup> See also his *Min. Works*, ii. 373, on the sense in which the first bishop of a Church might be said to 'succeed' its apostolic founder.

<sup>2</sup> *In Act. Hom.* 33. 2.



the list of kings.' A more futile *petitio* could hardly be met with: the Conqueror's kingship is a fact never doubted—the Petrine episcopate is just what is in question.<sup>1</sup>

And then we go on to Pope Sylvester and to Nicæa. Why, we asked, did not Sylvester, in the awful Arian crisis, exercise his 'prerogative of official infallibility'? Here are the 'replies': (1) Rome had done what was wanted in the days of the two Dionysii; the Alexandrian was complained of to the Roman for not confessing the Homoousion; the Roman 'expected' him to confess it; he replied that he did not deny it. But although Dionysius of Rome and his synod probably approved the term, it does not appear in his extant fragment;<sup>2</sup> and some years later it had been, at any rate, withdrawn, under pressure of heretical quibbling, by the great Council of Antioch. It was *not*, therefore, before the Nicene Council an established and recognized 'symbol' of the faith. In any case, would a Pope's action sixty years earlier excuse Sylvester for not speaking *ex cathedra* against Arians in presence of a far greater peril to the faith? (2) Well, but, says Mr. Rivington, we do not know that he was silent: his utterances may have perished, for only one Papal letter of that period has been preserved. At this point we are charged with 'coining history,' and of 'making no endeavour to realize the scene.' It is not *we* who are making history out of may-be's; and we do very clearly realize the strangeness, on the Papalist theory, of an *ex cathedra* Papal condemnation of Arianism being allowed by Catholics to be 'lost.' One more point as to the Nicene Council: we are told that we must not 'arbitrarily' dissociate Hosius from Sylvester, and that at Nicæa he signed first 'with two priests'; but Mr. Rivington omits to say that the delegation from Sylvester is expressly attributed to these two priests, and not to Hosius, who (for whatever reason) takes precedence of them, just as he afterwards presided at the Council of Sardica, although Rome's two representatives were present.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus distinguishes between the 'episcopate' as conferred on Linus, and the previous work of the two apostles at Rome. This determines the sense of 'from the apostles,' just as the sense of that phrase in Eusebius is determined by his words in iii. 2, 'After the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus is the first to obtain the episcopate of the Church of the Romans.'

<sup>2</sup> Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iii. 373. Mr. Rivington persists in quoting Döllinger's *History of the Church*, with such a use of the present tense as 'Dr. Döllinger says' or 'uses' (p. 17). In the *Guardian* of December 12, 1894, Dr. Plummer shows that such a proceeding is quite unjustifiable. Before 1870 Döllinger had said, 'Not a line of the earlier edition ought to be left as it stands.'

<sup>3</sup> Another 'question-begging' term.

<sup>4</sup> See Mansi, ii. 694, 697, iii. 66. As for 'the occurrence of a *simi-*

We are next taken back into the third century. Mr. Rivington had argued that the circumstances in which St. Cyprian wrote his *De Unitate*, and in which he denounced Novatianism, would not naturally 'lead him to the subject of Papal jurisdiction, 'which, indeed,' we are now told, would be 'irrelevant.' Why irrelevant, when the very point of the treatise was to draw out the doctrine of Church unity (insomuch that Papalist forgers were tempted to foist in clauses about 'Peter's primacy' and 'Peter's chair'), and when it would have been so effective an aggravation of Novatian's offence to describe him as a pretender to the unique office of Vicar of Christ and universal Shepherd? As to Cyprian's phrase, *originem unitatis*, we had complained of Mr. Rivington for rendering it as if it were *originem*, in apposition with *Petrum*; he had not only written, 'on Peter for an origin of unity,' but had repeatedly said, by way of gloss, 'According to St. Cyprian, St. Peter is the origin of the Church's unity,' and, 'this origin of unity which Peter was made.'<sup>1</sup> He now admits that his was 'a free translation.' Must we not call it a mis-translation, especially as used by Mr. Rivington? and can we help observing that he did not in his book enable the reader to check it by the Latin?<sup>2</sup> Obviously Peter might as well be called the *ratio* as the *origo*, so far as this passage goes. He retorts that we ourselves gave a paraphrase; we will now, therefore, translate, 'One Church, founded by Christ on Peter in the very commencement (or outset) of its oneness.' The difficulty lies in the next words, *et ratione*, which might mean 'and in its method or order' (as *ratio* is used in *Epist.* 33. 1), or 'in the account to be given of' (*De Exh. Mart. præf.* 5), or 'in the expression of,' its unity. To turn *unitatis* into a 'descriptive genitive' is very forced;<sup>3</sup> but to gloss it by saying that all 'members of the Church are aggregated to its first member by coming under his obedience' is worse exegetically. And the passage must be read with *Epist.* 73. 7, 'Peter, from whom the Lord instituted and showed the commencement of unity';<sup>4</sup>

larly constituted Papal embassy at the head of the signatures to subsequent councils,' its character as an 'embassy' is proclaimed, whereas Hosius is not so designated.

<sup>1</sup> *Prim. Ch. and S. of P.* pp. 55, 61, and also 464, 467.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 54. Cf. *Cypr. Ep.* 70. 3. The ablatives are not parallel to *voce Domini* in a similar passage, *Ep.* 43. 5, where, by the way, *cathedra una* means the office of the one collective episcopate (*De Unit.* 5; cf. Archbishop Benson in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* i. 745).

<sup>3</sup> This expedient is not adopted as to *unitatis originem* in *Ep.* 73. 7.

<sup>4</sup> By this we may interpret Pacian's words, quoted by Mr. Rivington, 'ut unitatem fundaret ex uno.'

and with another passage, as to which Mr. Rivington says he will be 'cruel enough to transcribe it.' We, for our part, do not feel the 'cruelty'; we are very glad to have the passage adduced; only let it be exactly rendered. It is not, 'In order to manifest unity, He by His own authority so placed the source of unity as to begin from one' (we see what is meant by this); but, 'in order to manifest unity, He by His own authority arranged the commencement of unity (as a commencement), beginning from one' (*De Unit.* 4). The verbs *ostendit* and *manifestaret* are key-words; and of course we do not understand Cyprian to mean anything so 'inane' as that Christ merely pointed to that quality of 'being one man and not two' which Peter 'shared with every one else.' The Cyprianic view, as we understand it, supposes our Lord to have selected one apostle because of the special qualities which gave him personal eminence, and *then* to have made his individuality significant as a symbol of the unity of all. In the same context Cyprian recognizes 'an equal power, an equal fellowship, *honoris et potestatis*,' in all the Apostles. How, then, does Mr. Rivington meet this? He reduces it to 'the priesthood'—that is, to what bishops share in common with presbyters. For this poor gloss he refers to a passage in Tertullian, in which there is no question of Apostolic powers; and to one of Cyprian's letters, in which *honor* and *potestas* mean 'the episcopal office.' But he does not give the text on which Cyprian grounds the statement before us; it is John xx. 21, 22, 'As My Father sent Me,' &c. Rather more in this than ordinary 'priesthood'!<sup>1</sup> Cyprian's *principalis* suggests the *principalitatem* of Irenæus's translator; and Mr. Rivington asserts that 'where we have the Greek form of *principalitas*, it is *ἀρχιεπρία*.' It is so in Hippolytus's representation of Iren. i. 24. 1 and i. 26. 1, and in Epiphanius's and Theodoret's expansions of i. 31. 1;<sup>2</sup> but in iv. 38. 3, a passage actually noticed by Mr. Rivington, '*principalitatem habebit*' appears as a translation of *πρωτεύει*. Did he not even look at the Greek here? Of course a 'first place,' like 'primacy,' is a very elastic term; its sense

<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine admits that in 'Ego mitto vos' there was 'given to the Apostles the same that was promised to Peter in 'Tibi dabo claves,' &c., i.e. *jurisdictionem plenissimam* (*De Rom. Pont.* c. 23, only, as he contends, in a certain subjection to Peter, *ibid.* c. 12). In his book, Mr. Rivington had allowed the 'equality' to refer to *some* apostolic powers, and to a 'subordinate jurisdiction' (pp. 61, 462). The use of *honor* in Tertullian's well-known passage is limited to the presbyterate (*Exh. Cast.* 7).

<sup>2</sup> Hippol. *Refut.* vii. 28, 33; Epiph. *Hær.* 38. 1; Theod. *Hær. Fab.* i. 15. These writers may have put *ἀρχιεπρία* for the ambiguous *ἀρχή*, which is rendered *principium* in i. 8. 5.

must be determined by the context. But *principalitas* is at least once<sup>1</sup> a rendering of a word used for 'original being,' just as *principalis* is sometimes 'principal' or 'chief,' more usually 'original.'

To leave Cyprian, his view of St. Peter in connexion with unity was not that he was its 'source,' or, as Mr. Rivington quietly slides in the term, its 'centre,' but that in him it was, so to speak, impersonated. The Papal view has one advantage over this, that it cannot be called fanciful; it is thoroughly practical. Had Cyprian held that view, he would not have talked of 'exhibiting' or 'illustrating' unity, but of securing it. In connexion with Cyprian Mr. Rivington observes that the words of St. Ambrose about St. Peter having a primacy 'confessionis, non honoris, fidei, non ordinis,' refer to what he was 'before our Lord had promised him the keys.' How, then, does Ambrose go on to interpret 'upon this rock'? '*Non de carne Petri, sed de fide,*' &c., a *fides* common to all the Apostles, though confessed by him *pro cæteris, immo præ cæteris*.<sup>2</sup>

Following Mr. Rivington's 'order,' we next come to the letter of the Council of Constantinople in 382 to 'St. Damasus and the West.' We had complained of his omission of the words, 'what has been lawfully and canonically settled by us.' He now charges us in turn with omitting 'as' before 'lawfully,' &c., and does not see that to insert it only brings out more fully the Easterns' conviction that their action had been canonically final. The West is asked to acquiesce on the ground that the Easterns had settled the affair. Then as to St. Basil and Eustathius: Mr. Rivington had talked of a 'Papal letter directing his restitution,' and had referred to Basil as saying that Rome should tell them on what conditions he was restored. 'The right settlement of the matter must come from Rome,' said St. Basil. Now here the impression given would be that Rome was the universal ordinary, or at least that she had universal jurisdiction. But Basil added a reason which would destroy this impression, to the effect that since Rome had trusted this

<sup>1</sup> Massuet explains *principalitate* in Iren. ii. 1. 2 by *principium*. It seems equivalent there to '*Proarche*.' In two other cases it seems to mean the 'Pleroma,' or highest world. As for iii. 3. 2, we have admitted the sense of 'pre-eminence.' But when Mr. Rivington claims both Thiersch and Stieren for his rendering ('sovereignty'), he shows that he has not read Stieren's note. Stieren gives Thiersch's Greek rendering *πρωτεῖαν* (which is not 'sovereignty'), but says that he is 'certain' that *principalitas* answers to *ἀρχαυτης*.

<sup>2</sup> Ambr. *De Incarn. Sacr.* 32 ff.

man's professions, had treated him as an orthodox bishop,<sup>1</sup> and so had brought trouble on the East, it was for her to 'set things right again.' This point, involving, rightly or not, a complaint against Rome, Mr. Rivington had ignored; he had, as we said, picked out what suited him, and left out what did not. Now, perforce, he does quote the words about Rome's having given to Eustathius 'power to injure the Churches.' Why did he not do so at first? He calls on us to give the whole passage from Basil; we do so in a foot-note,<sup>2</sup> and we repeat that Mr. Rivington in p. 225 of his book did keep back words which make rather *more* than 'an iota of difference.'

On the next point, Eusebius's statement that Aurelian resolved to assign the 'church-house' at Antioch to that party with which 'the Christian bishops in Italy and [in] the city of the Romans should communicate,' we admit that Heini-chen, whom we followed, seems to have antedated by some thirty years the use of 'Italy' in a restrictive sense for the north of the peninsula. Then what follows? That Eusebius, as far as his words imply, co-ordinates the whole Italian episcopate with the bishop of Rome, naming it first, and giving no hint at all of its being bound to echo whatever Rome said.<sup>3</sup>

Lastly, Julius I.'s letter to the Eusebians, which, we had said,

<sup>1</sup> The 'reinstating' letter, to which we had referred, is evidently that in Soc. iv. 12, in which there is nothing like a claim of Papal jurisdiction: the Pope, says Tillemont, vi. 543, 'merely recognizes Eustathius as a bishop of the Catholic Church, 'ce qui étoit un préjugé pour le faire reconnoître aussi par les autres; et c'est apparemment tout ce que S. Basile a voulu dire.' Cf. Tillemont, ix. 270; Newman's *Arians*, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> 'What were the propositions made to him by the most blessed bishop Liberius, and what he assented to, we know not, save that he brought a letter reinstating him, on showing which to the synod at Tyana he was restored to his place. This man is now devastating that faith on the ground of which he was received, and joins with those who anathematize the Homoousion, and is a leader of the heresy of the Pneumatomachi. Since, then, it was from thence that he gained the power to injure the Churches, and is using the freedom given him by you' (Westerns) 'for the overthrow of many, it is necessary that from thence also should come the setting right of matters, and that the Churches should be informed what were the terms on which he was received.'—Basil, *Ep.* 263. 3. (Cf. *Ep.* 226. 3, that he brought the Nicene Creed, as signed by him, from the West.) Apparently Basil supposed that there were some other 'terms' (beside the Nicene) which had been accepted by Eustathius. He was writing ten years after the Council of Tyana.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon sees so little prominence assigned here to Rome that he speaks only of 'the bishops of Italy' (ii. 263). He should have mentioned Rome; but Eusebius had not even named 'the *bishop* of Rome' distinctively.

was confusedly described by Mr. Rivington, supplies him now with an eighth topic.<sup>1</sup> As we might expect, the words of Socrates and Sozomen are put forward to colour the situation, as if Julius by words or acts had warranted a large subsequent extension of the prerogatives of Rome by two historians of the next century. What they say, as Tillemont remarks, 'paroist différent de ce que porte la lettre;' in fact, they make Julius say more than he does say; and it is the letter, not their words, that must decide. But looking at fourth-century evidence, Mr. Rivington writes as if the Council of Antioch in 341 'had' been held before the Eusebians tried to enlist Julius on their side. But they did so, according to Hefele, in 339;<sup>2</sup> their deputies asked Julius to assemble a Council on the case of Athanasius, and other like cases, and, 'if he pleased, to act as judge.'<sup>3</sup> He invited both parties to the Council.<sup>4</sup> Athanasius went to Rome; the Eusebians made unworthy excuses, and, after waiting for them nearly two years, Julius held his own Council, and the result was his famous letter. Mr. Rivington thinks that when he says, 'Word should have been written to us all,' he meant to himself, to the bishop of Antioch and other Easterns, to Athanasius, and to 'the other accused parties' (then at Rome). 'Good sense,' we are told, will not allow a further extension of 'all.' But the Easterns, including the *de facto* bishop of Antioch, were the persons to write, not to receive a letter; and Julius immediately adds other words, 'that so what was just might have been *determined by all*.' Mr. Rivington is very shy of these words. He writes as if they did not exist. But there they are; and what does Julius mean by them? He is referring to past wrong-doings of the Eusebians, when they condemned Athanasius and others in synods not properly representative of the collective episcopate. He tells them what, instead, they ought to have done; and in the context says that 'the bishops will have again to assemble,' and distinctly speaks of 'all' in antithesis to 'the sufferers.' The reference in the close of the letter to Alexandria, and to the custom of bringing its causes to Rome, touches quite distinct ground. Our desire, in the first article, to condense may have somewhat interfered (as in the Horatian experience) with distinctness; but we plainly said that, according to Julius, it was 'usual'

<sup>1</sup> Soc. ii. 8; Soz. iii. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Gwatkin dates it a year earlier, because he dates Athanasius's first return in 337.

<sup>3</sup> Athan. *Apol. c. Ari.* 20.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Rivington renders κληθῆναι, in *Apol.* i, 'summoned;' rather, 'called' or invited.



for Rome to judge in those cases; nor did we think of denying that he made a positive reference to St. Peter. We are, however, obliged to differ from Mr. Rivington as to the sense of that reference. 'What we have received from blessed Peter . . . this I also explain to you' is linked by 'for' with the words preceding, which refer to the special case of Athanasius (the successor of 'Marcus,' Peter's 'son') and not to the general subject of 'the whole letter,' to which, immediately afterwards, Julius returns. This will be plain to any who read the context.<sup>1</sup>

The concluding note obliges us to recur to another passage in Mr. Rivington's book, on which we had commented. He had said, not once, but twice, though without giving the reference, that Damasus and a council had described the 318 bishops of the Nicene Council as '*directed from the city of the most holy bishop of Rome.*' We pointed out that the text distinguished the 318 from persons '*ex parte . . . episcopi . . . Romæ directi,*' and that *directi* was a technical term for 'sent as legates,' whereas Mr. Rivington had in effect represented the whole Nicene Council as acting under 'directions' or orders from Rome. To call this, as we did, a piece of 'very discreditable carelessness' would now be too mild a censure. Mr. Rivington has made the matter worse: for he now, without acknowledging our criticism, and just as if he were correcting an erratum, requests the reader to insert words that mark the distinction; but he still keeps the rendering '*directed,*' without noticing, or in any way replying to, the proof which we gave of its erroneousness, and which we could have enlarged abundantly.<sup>2</sup> And here we leave what he has entitled his 'Reply.' Of its tone we will say but this—that we trust it would be impossible for an Anglican.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Athan. *Apol.* 35. The point for which Julius (rightly or not) claims a 'tradition from Peter' is clearly the same for which he refers to 'the directions of Paul.' And *there* he is speaking of their conduct *re Alexandria* as such.

<sup>2</sup> He now says, 'It is the separate mention of the legates to which attention is meant to be drawn when speaking of the work of the council.' Certainly the legates are mentioned after the bishops (see Theod. ii. 22); but the point is that Mr. Rivington had (1) substituted 'from the city of the . . . bishop' for 'on the part of the . . . bishop of the city'; (2) had overlooked this 'separate mention' of legates; (3) had rendered *directi* by '*directed*' instead of by '*sent*'; and (4) had adduced the misquoted passage as proving 'that the legates *exercised a real influence,* because the Council was '*directed*' from Rome. As he now takes it, still mis-translating *directi*, it would prove that Sylvester influenced his own legates, which is hardly worth proving.

<sup>3</sup> This 'tone' is avowedly a requital of what Mr. Rivington calls our 'discourtesy.' We are sorry that our words should have given him

## ART. II.—UPTON'S HIBBERT LECTURES ON THE BASES OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

*The Hibbert Lectures, 1893. Lectures on the Bases of Religious Belief.* Delivered in Oxford and London in April and May, 1893. By CHARLES B. UPTON, B.A., B.Sc., Professor of Philosophy in Manchester College. (London and Edinburgh, 1894.)

THESE striking lectures show how greatly their author is indebted to the writings of Professor Lotze and Dr. Martineau. But they are very far indeed from being merely a reproduction of works of those great thinkers. They are marked by independence of judgment and original powers of mind. Readers who will give them the attention and thought which their difficulty requires and their ability deserves, are likely to find the perusal of them full of interest and suggestion.

The lectures contain much, the value of which will be recognized by serious theists. The marked ability with which, in the third lecture, the opinions of Mr. Frederic Harrison and Mr. Herbert Spencer are treated, and the sustained power of the long assault upon Hegelianism in the eighth lecture, call for special notice. Professor Upton is at home in the subjects he is there discussing, and advocates of the theories he rejects will find in him a formidable antagonist.

To many readers, among the most interesting features of the book will be the treatment of the indications of the being of God and the arguments in support of immortality. Professor Upton thinks 'faith in immortality' to be 'indispensable both for man's happiness and for his persistent moral endeavour' (p. 343), and believes this 'faith' to be supported by the study of the world and human life. In the 'ideas and

offence; but plain-spoken criticism is unfortunately apt to offend the criticized, and our criticism was bound to be plain-spoken. When a seceder from the English Church, who, while in her service, was better known, to speak frankly, for preaching gifts than for attainments in theology or history, attacks her position in a book so pretentious in tone, and so unsound in argument, it is not a case for studiously soft words. But the complaint reminds us of a similar charge made by Papal writers twenty years ago against Mr. Gladstone, and it may not be inopportune to quote part of his comment: 'For the last thirty years, in this country at least, Ultramontanism has been very busy in making controversial war upon other people, with singularly little restraint of language, and has had far too little of the truth told to itself. Hence it has lost the habit, almost the idea, of equal laws in discussion' (*Vaticanism*, p. 111).

aspirations' of man, compared with 'the limits of' his 'earthly existence' (p. 347); in his 'moral nature' (p. 352); in the 'character which grows stronger and stronger in a good man's life, which is mighty enough to bear up patiently under all disease and trial, which no temptations, however mighty, can divert from its course, and which grows firmer and solidier as the body ages and grows weaker' (pp. 352, 353); in the 'genius' of 'the world's greatest thinkers, artists, and poets,' 'only fully recognized' in many cases 'after they' have 'departed this life' (p. 353); in the 'spiritual consciousness of communion with' God (p. 354); in the belief that 'the Divinity which is immanent in' human 'consciousness' would be 'baffled, confounded, and disappointed if this short life were all' (p. 355), he sees the signs of a future and immortal life.

The 'teleological argument' for the being of God is accepted in the new form in which it has been taught by theistic writers, and notably by Dr. Martineau, with the intention of showing its consistency with the theory of Evolution. To the 'cosmological argument' Professor Upton devotes a considerable amount of space. He rejects emphatically the theory of Mr. John Stuart Mill and other writers that 'Cause means only uniformity of relation among phenomena' (p. 212), and, accepting a view which in its main features was adopted from Kant by Dr. Martineau, that 'the changes in nature are caused by some really efficient power or force which our outward senses cannot discern, but which we always mentally supply after the analogy of our own consciousness of efficient volitional Causation' (pp. 213-14), he is of opinion that the being of God is postulated by the condition of the world. The argument, however, is accepted by him in an entirely different form from that in which it is most familiarly known. Laying down that the 'word "Cause" has two quite distinct meanings—a scientific meaning and a philosophical or theological one' (p. 206)—he proceeds, in the following passage, to criticize a statement of Professor Flint:<sup>1</sup>

'The "infinite regress of causes" which the scientist in question regards as the fact which renders the hypothesis of a God unnecessary, refers, of course, to scientific causes; that is to say, to the modes of force which succeed one another in the universe, and

<sup>1</sup> Flint, *Theism*, p. 120: 'We may believe either in a self-existent God or in a self-existent world, and must believe in one or the other; we cannot believe in an infinite regress of causes. The alternatives of a self-existent cause and an infinite regress of causes are not, as some would represent, equally credible alternatives. The one is an indubitable truth, the other is a manifest absurdity. The one all men believe, the other no man believes.'

which, from the scientific point of view, are said to *cause* one another. The shrinking nebula, for instance, causes the intense heat of the central mass; the heat of the sun causes the evaporation of the ocean; evaporation causes the formation of rain-drops; rain-drops cause the invigoration and growth of vegetation, &c., &c. Now, the scientist whom Professor Flint is aiming to refute maintains that this regress of causes is an infinite regress, and that therefore the assumption of God as a Cause is quite uncalled for, seeing that Science can get on as well or better without Him' (p. 206).

With the position of the supposed 'scientist' that the 'regress of causes' is 'an infinite regress' Professor Upton agrees, but he maintains that

'the existence of this infinite regress of causes in' the 'scientific sense, is precisely the fact which demands for its adequate explanation the belief in God as the ultimate Ground or Cause, in the philosophical or theological sense' (p. 207).

In other words, he transfers the idea of Causation, in this connexion, from the past to the present. On his theory there never was a beginning to the life of the Universe—Creation is as eternal as its Creator. Consequently, there is no need and no place for a 'First Cause' in the ordinary sense of the phrase. Nevertheless, to his mind, the universe is eternally and continually dependent upon God. The 'self-consciousness' of man, the 'ordinary phenomena of cause and effect in the physical world' (pp. 224-5), the 'higher forms of human affection with their marvellous power of annihilating all self-seeking,' are 'considerations' which

'powerfully endorse the intuitive judgment which we cannot help forming, that our finite life and the life of all finite energies and finite minds is immediately dependent on, and indivisibly connected with, that Universal Self-existent Life which in the case of self-conscious man reveals itself in the ideals of truth, beauty, and goodness which immediately assert in the soul their universal character and their absolute worth' (p. 226).

It is possible, on this point, to agree with Professor Upton in much which he affirms without doing so in what he denies. The argument which is based on the present and continual dependence of all things upon God is unquestionably of weight. It will appeal to all serious theists. It may lead some who have abandoned any form of theistic belief to reconsider their position. All this may be said without following Professor Upton in his denial of the 'cosmological argument' in the form in which it has been presented by, for instance, Professor Flint. On the particular theory of the immanence of God in the universe which pervades this as well

as every other part of the *Hibbert Lectures*, and is inextricably connected with the opinion of the lecturer on this subject, we shall have occasion to write later; but we may say here that he appears to us to allow altogether insufficient weight to the very powerful argument which has often been formulated, that there is a regress of successive causes which cannot be infinite, but necessarily postulates a First Cause which is itself uncaused. It is difficult to see how, apart from his particular view of the immanence of God, Professor Upton would be able to say that he finds 'nothing inconceivable or improbable in' 'an infinite regress,' and that 'the difficulty with' him 'would be to conceive of a regress of scientific causes which is not infinite' (p. 207).

There are many incidental allusions and subordinate arguments in the lectures to which, if we were to go through them in detail, we should be bound to take serious exception. Instances of these are in the misleading statement that

'there is good reason to believe that Jesus only gave fuller and more perfect expression to noble thoughts and sentiments which were fermenting in the consciousness of many of the choicer spirits among His countrymen, when He declared the relation between the soul and God to be of the most inward and intimate character, and accordingly sometimes spoke of God as "Love," and at other times as "the Father within Him"' (pp. 57-8);

in the contention that

'careful historical research and criticism, as well as the study of comparative religion, have shown the utter untenableness of the old claim set up by the Churches for the wholly exceptional inspiration and infallibility of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures' (p. 99);

and in the assumption of 'the agnosticism of the Book of Job' (p. 115).

Such features of a work, however incidental and subordinate they may be, must never be altogether ignored. They inevitably have their influence on arguments with which they are not specifically and consciously connected, and they are highly significant of methods of thought.

The discussion of such matters as those to which we have alluded would, however, be less appropriate to our present purpose than the consideration of the general standpoint of the lectures.

Professor Upton by no means agrees with all the conclusions of the *Critique of the Pure Reason*, but he accepts as 'fundamental and important' 'Kant's distinction between Reason and Understanding' (p. 64). He regards the 'faculty

of the soul which Kant calls Reason (*Vernunft*) 'as 'precisely the faculty'

'whereby the human mind becomes intuitively aware of the presence and operation in its self-consciousness of a Reality which is not felt and thought to be finite and dependent, as the individual soul itself is felt and thought to be, but is felt and thought to be Absolute, Uncreated, and therefore of ultimate and unconditional worth and authority' (p. 68).

Upon this 'Reason' or 'Spiritual Insight,' or 'Revelation,' as, after Dr. Martineau, he insists on calling it, Religion is based. The 'ideas of our theoretical and practical reason' 'are a revelation in us of the true nature and essence of the Eternal Substance, God' (p. 43). The 'self-consciousness' of man 'directly reveals the relation of his finite personality to the Universal and the Eternal' (p. 48). It is, in the lecturer's judgment, to be regretted that 'the term "revealed" has been appropriated by those religionists who regard religious ideas and beliefs' 'as entering the soul in an entirely exceptional way through a particular historical channel, and therefore as not discerned by that light of Reason "which lighteth every man coming into the world," but by some other mode of revelation given in a so-called "miraculous" way' (pp. 76, 77). It is 'in our self-consciousness' that 'God immediately reveals Himself' (p. 85), and 'only' in it that any revelation is 'truly' made (p. 94).

The possibility of such a view of 'Reason' rests upon the most fundamental point which the lectures contain. To Professor Upton, in spite of the fact that he is an earnest Unitarian, the declaration of the Creed of Nicæa that the Lord Jesus Christ is 'of one substance with the Father' affords no difficulty. The fault of the Creed in his eyes is not that it thus speaks about our Lord, but that it 'confines to the particular case of Jesus a relation with God which holds good of every rational soul.' 'All rational souls are of the same substance with the Eternal Cause and Ground from Whom they arise, and in Whom they still have their being' (p. 140). They are 'reproductions of' the 'Essence' of 'the Supreme Being' (p. 116). 'All forms of finite existence are of the same nature as that Eternal Life in which they originate' (pp. 185, 186). 'The self-same God' is 'identically immanent in every atom and in every soul' (p. 285). 'The universe, with all its modes of matter, force, and consciousness,' is 'the form in which the Eternal God calls into existence, by a partial self-sundering, it would seem, of His own essential being, this universe of centres of energy and personal selves'



(p. 10). 'The constituents of the cosmos, from the ultimate element of the ether-vortex up to the flower in the meadow, the bird floating in the air, and man building churches and worshipping the Supreme, are, one and all, differentiations of that Eternal Substance, God, in Whom every particle of the whole has its ground, and from Whom it derives its special character. Every atom of nature is instinct with energy and life; it is, as it were, a portion and visible manifestation of the Eternal Life' (pp. 218, 219).

On such a theory of nature and human life, it is not illogical to hold that the high thoughts of man are themselves revelations, and to seek for 'what is most essential and permanent in man's idea of God' 'in those conceptions of the Supreme Being which are now found in minds who in the greatest degree combine the deepest personal religious experience with the fullest rational insight into the highest culture of the time' (p. 25), and it is easy to set altogether aside the dogmas which have been believed to possess the authority of an objectively revealed Faith.

It may be questioned how far Professor Upton is consistent with himself. A theory of the immanence of God which represents all the parts of the universe as being, in his frequently repeated phrase, 'differentiations' of the 'substance' of the Supreme Being, can hardly be logically developed without resulting in Pantheism and in the denial of free will. Yet to Pantheism the lecturer is earnestly opposed, and his powerful attack on Hegelianism is, to a large extent, a vindication of the free will which that system practically denies. He himself evidently believes that he has found 'a true and satisfactory mean between Deism and Pantheism' (p. 293). He regards 'rational souls possessed of freedom of will' as being 'gifted with that high degree of individuality which constitutes them truly "other" than the Eternal' (p. 10). He pleads for an 'effective distinction between God and the world of matter and mind' (p. 322). He places in contrast the position of the 'Pantheist' and that of the 'Ethical Theist' which he is prepared to adopt:

'The Pantheist sees in his own inner life but phases or modes of the life of the cosmos manifesting itself under such limiting conditions as the particular stages of biological, intellectual, and sociological developments necessitate; and though, as he contemplates his own past career, he may see much that is repulsive to his ideal of beauty and perfection in the sensual and selfish passions which at times in his case realize themselves in his character and conduct, yet he cannot consistently, as Spinoza admits, feel repentance or remorse

for such phases of his existence, since from the Pantheistic standpoint they are all necessary temporal stages in the evolution of the Eternal Thought. To the Ethical Theist, on the other hand, the ideals which visit his soul and claim his allegiance are not simply influences from the Universal Soul which necessarily find a definite expression in accordance with the particular character of the individual soul which feels them: they are invitations and injunctions arising in the dependent soul by the immanent action of the Universal Soul, and the former is, to a certain very real extent, left free to determine itself in favour of or against these divine influences' (pp. 332, 333).

'While Pantheism holds that God's nature is exhaustively manifested in the cosmos, Theism maintains that the inner nature of God transcends all phenomenal manifestations' (p. 339).

'It is because the Conscience makes known the possibility in man of *resisting* the injunctions of the moral imperative that it reveals a clear distinction between the Will or Personality of God and the will or personality of man, and thus confers upon the latter an independent value and importance which it always tends to lose when the relation between man and God is viewed solely from the standpoint of the pure reason or intellect. Just as the feeling of *resistance* renders most men quite unable to doubt the reality of an external world, so does the consciousness of spiritual resistance, as presented in the discord felt at times between the human will and the invitations and injunctions of the Ideal, *i.e.* of the indwelling God, make it impossible for anyone in whom ethical experience is vivid to remain satisfied with any theory which treats the human spirit as merely a transient mode of the Universal Spirit. Wherever the Conscience is regarded as revealing a supreme authority, there complete Pantheism becomes impossible, and individual spirits become of quite infinite significance and worth' (pp. 243, 244).

Our view of the place of conscience in human thought and life is not the same as Professor Upton's, but we certainly agree with him that it is logically impossible to allow the authority of conscience and to accept any form of Pantheistic belief. For if conscience means anything at all, the will of man is free, and free will is inconsistent with Pantheism. But what we feel about Professor Upton's lectures is that every blow he strikes at Hegelianism, and in defence of free will, is also indirectly a blow, not only at acknowledged Pantheism, but at his own theory of the immanence of God as well. If man is a 'differentiated' 'portion' of the 'substance' of God, it is difficult to see how his will can be free. We have carefully considered all that Professor Upton has written on the personality of man, and cannot see anything to enable us to modify the opinion we have expressed. That there are serious objections to admitting personality and denying free will is true, but this truth throws doubt, not

on our argument, but on the whole theory of the lectures on the relation of man to God. Is it conceivable that the Supreme Being should allow His own nature to be used against Himself? If it is not, every argument in favour of free will is an argument against the position that man is 'of one substance' with God. We must either say that the nature of man is not identical with the nature of God, or we must deny that man's will is free, and that individual men have true personalities. Were it otherwise, the glory of God that His Nature is, of its Essence, necessarily sinless would be gone.

In proportion, then, as we think Professor Upton's arguments against Hegelianism and Pantheism and in support of free will to be of weight and of value, we distrust his teaching on the most fundamental point in his whole position, the relation of the universe to the Supreme Being.

Is it possible to form a theological system which will allow for the truths which underlie the *Hibbert Lectures* for 1893, and will at the same time avoid their inconsistencies? It is of importance that such an inquiry should be made. It is of little avail to point out errors without asserting truth. In all errors that can claim a hearing there is some distortion of truth, and it is the business of the critic to try and see what is the truth that has been distorted.

There is a true sense in which the 'immanence' of God may be asserted. It may be said to be more than 'probable that matter depends for its existence upon the constant efficacy of God's power and presence.'<sup>1</sup> 'To assert God's presence in His works' while refusing 'to identify Him with them'<sup>2</sup> is but to repeat the teaching of the great theologians of the undivided Church.<sup>3</sup> He who created the universe out of

<sup>1</sup> Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, chap. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Liddon, *Elements of Religion*, p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> The two sides of this doctrine are very clearly taught by St. Augustine. See, e.g., *De Fide et Symbolo*, ii.: 'Credimus omnia Deum fecisse de nihilo, quia, etiamsi de aliqua materia factus est mundus, eadem ipsa materia de nihilo facta est, ut ordinatissimo Dei munere prima capacitas formarum fieret, ac deinde formarentur quæcumque formata sunt.' *Conf. xii. 7*: 'Fecisti enim cælum et terram non de Te, nam esset æquale Unigenito Tuo, ac per hoc et Tibi; et nullo modo justum esset, ut æquale Tibi esset, quod de Te non esset. Et aliud præter Te non erat, unde faceres ea, Deus una Trinitas, et trina Unitas; et ideo de nihilo fecisti cælum et terram.' *De Civit. Dei*, vii. 30: 'Hæc autem facit atque agit unus verus Deus; sed sicut Deus, id est, ubique totus, nullis inclusus locis, nullis vinculis alligatus, in nullas partes sectilis, ex nulla parte mutabilis, implens cælum et terram præsentem potentia, non indigente natura. Sic itaque administrat omnia quæ creavit, ut etiam ipsa proprios exercere

nothing, in sharp contrast to the eternal begetting of the Only-begotten Son of His own Substance, and the eternal Procession of the Divine Spirit in the same Substance, remains with and in that which He has made. The Personal Word who is the Power of God and the Wisdom of God maintains by His Omnipresence all creation. But neither does He cease to be what He has always been, nor does creation become that which He is. If the word 'immanence' is not one which we ourselves, with modern science and philosophy before us, would have chosen to have used, there is a true sense in which God is 'immanent' in the universe, but that true sense does not bring us one step nearer the confusing or the identification of the nature of God with the nature of man.

Professor Upton evidently regards it as a welcome inference from his theory of the eternity of the 'cosmos,' that it removes the possibility of a past solitariness of the Supreme Being, and enhances the aspect of the Eternal Father in which He may be said to be 'ever sacrificing Himself that Nature and Humanity may live,' so that 'we may believe that our finite experiences can give but a faint inkling' of His 'infinite sympathy with the joys and woes of His dependent offspring' (p. 268). The same idea, we remember, occurs prominently in Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*, where the 'lonely infinitude' of God is spoken of as a result of regarding the 'cosmos' as short of eternal.<sup>1</sup> To the Unitarian, indeed, there is no alternative between a 'lonely God' and an eternal 'cosmos'; for those who hold the doctrine of the Trinity there was before the creation of the Universe society and love within the Godhead.<sup>2</sup>

There are real needs of theological thought underlying the particular theory of the 'immanence' of God from which we have dissented, and that also of the eternity of the 'cosmos.' They find their true satisfaction in the doctrine of the inner life and presence in the world of the Holy Trinity.

The traditional theology of Christendom accepts the statement of the book of Genesis<sup>3</sup> that man was made in the 'image of God.' A truth so profound influences the whole thought of those who believe it. It points to a real ground et agere motus sinat. Quamvis enim nihil esse possint sine ipso, non sunt quod ipse.' The same teaching is perhaps the most striking feature in the treatises of St. Athanasius *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*.

<sup>1</sup> Martineau, *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., St. Aug. *De Trinitate*, viii. 10, ix. 1-5; Lacordaire, *Conférence de la Vie intime de Dieu*.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. i. 27, ix. 6.

of union, even before the Incarnation, between God and man. It opens up vast possibilities for human nature. It contains the promise of Divine aid. If it brings a deep solemnity into life, it denotes privilege and it conveys hope.

The privilege is that truth of which Professor Upton's theory of the 'one substance' of God and man is the distortion. Man's nature, by reason of its spiritual character and its rational powers, is the reflection of the eternal being of Almighty God. In virtue of this character and these powers it has the capacity of moral likeness to God. That moral likeness existed in the possession of the supernatural gifts which were lost in the fall. It can be, and is, restored by the work of the Incarnation.

The restoration in man of moral likeness to God is the perfecting of his nature. It is part of his destiny, if his own will accepts the purposes of God, that all his needs will be satisfied, all his faculties raised to their highest possible capacity, all his life made perfect in beauty, in power, in enjoyment. But the perfection is that of the creature, not of the Creator. It satisfies the desires of man because that which each being craves for is its own perfection. Man has what he needs in moral likeness to the All Holy without the identification of his nature with the 'substance' of God.<sup>1</sup>

Man, created in the image of God, has faculties for seeing God. These faculties enable him to discern the truths which are taught in nature and to receive those which God in specific ways reveals. Revelation is not one of their ordinary works, but a special operation of God upon them.

Catholic theology coincides with the common sense of mankind in recognizing a great distortion in human life.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The expression in 2 St. Pet. i. 4, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως is well explained by St. Thomas Aquinas, *in loco*, 'Non consortio æqualitatis, quod est trium personarum solum: sed consortio participationis, quod est omnium fidelium per gratiam in præsentī, et gloriam in futuro.'

<sup>2</sup> There are many keen observers of nature and man who feel strongly the force of the thought expressed in Browning's *Gold Hair*:

'The candid incline to surmise of late  
That the Christian faith may be false, I find;  
For our Essays-and-Reviews' debate  
Begins to tell on the public mind,  
And Colenso's words have weight:

'I still, to suppose it true, for my part,  
See reasons and reasons; this, to begin:  
'Tis the faith that launched point-blank her dart  
At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,  
The Corruption of Man's Heart.'

The faculties whereby truth is to be grasped, no less than those by which holiness is to be attained, have been wounded. The power of seeing God needs restoration as well as training.

The sense of capacity and the sense of dependence are better satisfied by such a doctrine of objective Revelation as Catholic theology asserts, than by the theory that the word 'revelation' is truly applied to what it has been usual to call the work of 'natural religion.' Moreover, Catholic teaching on the subject of Revelation allows for the sense of distortion which is not less characteristic of man than the feelings of capacity and dependence.

Professor Upton describes 'the complete conception of Religion' as not being

'reached till we recognize the fact that the immanent God is apprehended by the religious consciousness, not only as the Light of its reason, but as the Source of its moral imperative and its moral ideal, and is also directly *felt* as in immediate personal relation with the soul' (p. 29).

The apprehension of God 'by the religious consciousness' is made possible by objective Revelation; the 'immediate personal relation' with God is conveyed to the soul by the Sacraments.

We are convinced that the true satisfaction for the claims of reason and morality which are so strongly emphasized in these lectures is to be found in the theology and practice of the Catholic Church.

What is the central reason why the consideration of the same phenomena leads us to wholly different conclusions from those which are contained in the work which we are reviewing? It is to be found, we think, in the difference of our attitude towards our Lord Jesus Christ.

To Professor Upton, our Lord is Divine only in the sense in which, on his theory, all men are divine. While He may be called the greatest of teachers, there was not in Him any vision of God or any relationship to God to which any pure-hearted man cannot attain.

'Jesus had ever spoken of God as the Father within Him; and though there is good reason to believe that He himself never dreamed that the Eternal was immanent or incarnate in Him in any different sense to that in which He is immanent in every rational soul, it is not surprising, when all the circumstances of the case are taken into account, that the world's greatest Prophet and religious Teacher was at length, by the imagination of His enthusiastic disciples, exclusively identified with that Divine Word or Reason which the philosophical



believers of that day regarded as the indispensable intermediary between the Eternal God and the human mind and heart. In this way, the son of Mary of Nazareth was removed out of the category of humanity, and conceived of as the Son of God in a quite different sense to that in which, in the view of the rational religionist, all men are sons of God' (p. 135).

'Rational Religion rests its claim to be received as true on the ground that its principles are endorsed, or may be endorsed, by the direct personal experience of each individual soul; while Dogmatic Religion rests its claim to acceptance on some outward authority altogether extrinsic to the believer's own self-consciousness. Rational Religion, in the person of Jesus, declares that real insight into the nature of God, and into the relationship between Him and the spirit of man, is accessible to everyone in proportion to the increasing purity of his conscience and his heart. Dogmatic Christianity, on the other hand, lays down a doctrine of the tri-une nature of God, which no purity of heart, however great, has the slightest tendency either to discover or to confirm, and then proceeds to declare the belief in this dogma to be an essential factor of true religion' (p. 136).

If our Lord were only man, the lecturer's theory of revelation might well be true. The teaching of Christ would be the result of the action of the Eternal Father directly upon His mind, and there would be no reason why this action should be more intimate in His case than in any other case. It would follow that the 'personal experience' of other 'individual souls' might be no less revelations of Divine truth.

But if our Lord, in a true and distinctive sense, is God as well as Man—that is to say, if there are in Him two different Natures united in a single Person, and if the higher of these Natures is of 'one substance with the Father,' and of a different substance from that of man, while the lower Nature is human—the case is altogether changed. He is, on this hypothesis, a giver as well as a recipient. His utterances are the teaching of God as well as the voice of man. His declarations about God or man are a revelation in a specific sense.

The acceptance of Christ as a Divine teacher because He Himself is personally God leads on to a series of doctrines inconsistent with the book under review. The Old Testament is ratified as being an instrument under the special guidance of God for the training of man, and as being an authoritative work to which appeal can be made.<sup>1</sup> The New Testament comes under the promise of the guidance of the Holy Spirit.<sup>2</sup> There is a doctrine of the Church as a body

<sup>1</sup> See, *e.g.*, St. John v. 39. But the whole of the Ministry is an illustration of the worth of the Old Testament.

<sup>2</sup> St. John xiv. 16, 26, xvi. 13.

which is to rule Christians, in which is to be the permanent presence of Christ, and which is to be protected from such failure in thought or life as would amount to the prevailing of the powers of evil against it.<sup>1</sup> There are Sacraments, the use of which is necessary to salvation, and which convey the closest union with Christ Himself.<sup>2</sup> There is a whole system of revealed truth about God in which the mind may rest.

There are in human thought points where ways diverge and minds must choose. The dogma of the Godhead of Christ as a distinctive Nature essentially different from the nature of man, is such a point—or rather it is, with one exception, the most important of all such points. Many and great as are the divergences between professors of religion, there is only one starting point of difference which is more influential than this. Short of the line which divides believers in a personal God from those who have no such belief, there is no line which forms so great a division as that between those who accept and those who disbelieve the Deity of Christ.

It is beyond the power of human reasoning to search out why it is, in individual cases, that on the same evidence different minds should reach different conclusions on such a point. But without presuming to pass any judgment on those who, without any signs of lack of earnest purpose or honest study, hold opinions about our Lord diametrically opposed to our own, we may be allowed to notice the great and cumulative force of the evidence for His Deity.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the converging lines of evidence we have in view. The four Epistles which even extreme critics of a negative kind admit are by St. Paul contain teaching which is unintelligible on any other hypothesis than that our Lord was regarded as God, and St. Paul certainly did not think that there was one substance of God and man.<sup>3</sup> The Synoptical Gospels, in their accounts of Christ's Birth and Resurrection, their histories of His Ministry with its miracles,<sup>4</sup> their testimony to His tremendous claims,<sup>5</sup> are the records of facts which postulate His Godhead. The signifi-

<sup>1</sup> St. Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17, xxviii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> St. John iii. 5, vi. 53-7.

<sup>3</sup> See Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, lecture vi.

<sup>4</sup> See Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, chap. iv.

<sup>5</sup> St. Matt. iv. 19, v. 17-48, viii. 22, ix. 9, x. 12-15, 37, xix. 21, xxv. 31-46, xxviii. 20; St. Mark ii. 14; St. Luke v. 27, ix. 59-62, xii. 51-3, xiv. 26.

cance of the Fourth Gospel, as even Dr. Martineau<sup>1</sup> admitted, depends entirely on the Deity of our Lord.

The tide has turned in the historical criticism of the New Testament. It is no longer necessary to refer to the Gospels with a half fear that the theories of Tübingen may after all be true, and invalidate all that is said. There are the strongest critical reasons for regarding not only the first three, but the four Gospels, as verily and indeed works of the first century.<sup>2</sup>

Any view of Christ's character which regards it as strong and consistent and honest requires His Deity.<sup>3</sup> The testimony of His friends, the companions of His Ministry, His chosen Apostles, bears witness to the same doctrine. The tradition of the Church, embodying the teaching of the Apostles, makes the same declaration. The gradual growth of the prophetic picture of the Messiah in the Old Testament is a valuable corroboration of what may be regarded as otherwise proved.

If anything is clear about the Ministry and Teaching of Christ, it is that He did not represent other men as being on a level with Himself. In view of the Gospels, it is no less intolerable to say that He was Divine because all other men are divine also, than to deny that He is God.

To make the sharp distinction which to us appears to be necessary between our Lord and all other men, united with Him as they are on the other hand by the fact of His true Humanity, is to put an end to all theories which break down the essential difference between the Nature of God and the nature of man.

The same distinction affirms, further, the revelation of God in Christ as surpassing all other teaching, as differing in kind from the highest thoughts of men, as being the utterance of infallible truth, as ratifying the Old Testament, and certifying the doctrines of the Church.

We can hardly hope that Professor Upton will reconsider

<sup>1</sup> Martineau, *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 426: 'Take away the Godhead of Christ, as the entire real meaning of even His ministry in Palestine, and there is not an incident or a speech in the Fourth Gospel which does not lose its significance, and leave on the mind the hazy impression of a half-understood discourse in a foreign tongue.'

<sup>2</sup> See Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century: Fourth Gospel*; Westcott, *Gospel of St. John: History of the Canon of the New Testament*; Lightfoot, *Essays on the Work entitled 'Supernatural Religion'*; *Biblical Essays*; Salmon, *Introduction to the New Testament*; Dale, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*.

<sup>3</sup> See Lacordaire, *Conférence de la Vie intime de Jésus-Christ*; Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, lecture iv., and Preface to the fourteenth edition, p. xxx.

opinions upon which he has evidently deeply thought. But we may hope that those who are fascinated by the brilliant power of the anti-Hegelian sections of his lectures will observe how his own arguments on this subject supply the refutation of his distinctive position, and be led to think how the old truths of the Catholic Church satisfy and explain the earnest longings which underlie his theological opinions, while the Christ of the Gospels is the real Teacher of those truths.

#### ART. III.—DR. PUSEY.

*Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D.* By H. P. LIDDON, D.D. Edited and Prepared for Publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., and the Rev. R. J. WILSON, D.D. Vol. III. (London, 1894.)

THOSE to whom Dr. Liddon's memory is among the treasured things of life will look at the three goodly volumes, which represent the whole manuscript entrusted to his literary executors,<sup>1</sup> with feelings in which pride and satisfaction are almost neutralized by distressful regret; for the work, conceived as it was on so large a scale, and demanding, as in the author's eyes it did, such strenuous effort in the elaboration of all its details, imposed on him a burden which, coupled with other grave anxieties, made him old long before his time, and conspired with the disease which cut short a precious life. The editors, in their admirable preface to the first volume, assign two reasons for the proportions which the biography assumed. 'It was,' they say, 'a task in which his deepest affections and interests were concerned. It was the setting forth the life-work and delineating the character of one who was to him . . . to use the words of his diary, "the most dear and revered of friends,"' &c. But no man would be justified in 'determining at once to resign' the duties and opportunities of such a charge as the Professorship of Exegesis, merely in order to find time for composing a memoir of a friend, however beloved. The other motive described is far more cogent. 'Dr. Pusey was also, in Dr. Liddon's eyes, one of the prime leaders, and, as time went on, the main support, of that great Church movement which, in his opinion, reinvigorated, and even revived, the religion

<sup>1</sup> The whole of vol. iii. is practically Dr. Liddon's, although the editors have had to supply a part of what belongs to the year 1856.

of England.' His biographer was not, then, writing a mere 'Life'; he was writing, in effect, the history of the English Church at a most critical period of her career; and the volume now before us undoubtedly exhibits Dr. Pusey as brought to the front, by the inevitable conditions of his time, with a distinctness simply unique. Yet, after full recognition of this fact, a reader may be pardoned for thinking that the author was sometimes a little too much swayed by his natural unwillingness 'to curtail'—still more 'to omit'—any letter whatever of Dr. Pusey's or of Mr. Keble's,<sup>1</sup> although some of them might well have been abridged, and the purport of others summarized. And the same reader may possibly be unable to repress a smile when, after having been conducted (under the motto of 'Stemmata quid faciunt') through all the ramifications of the Pusey family history, from the legend about King Cnut's ingenious 'officer' to the death of the last female descendant in the year of the French Revolution, he discovers that the great Tractarian who has made the name world-famous had no more blood-relationship to the Puseys than he had to the reigning House; that both name and estate had been bequeathed to the nephew of a sister-in-law, 'the Hon. Philip Bouverie,' the descendant of a family once settled on the Belgian frontier, and the father of Edward, who was thus 'by descent a French Walloon'<sup>2</sup> (i. 458). Fourteen pages are then devoted to the Bouverie antecedents, which, curiously enough, involve the fortunes of a 'Protestant exile,' and four others to the lineage of 'Pusey's grandmother on his father's side;' and if these latter inquiries have their significance, it might perhaps have been more succinctly exhibited; but then we should have lost what is at least of equal interest, a genuine touch of Dr. Liddon's personality.

If on a very few occasions the biographer's judgment betrays the influence of his almost filial predilections,<sup>3</sup> it is

<sup>1</sup> Pref. to vol. i. p. vi.

<sup>2</sup> In 1828 he seriously thought of resuming his father's proper name of Bouverie (*Life*, i. 142).

<sup>3</sup> E.g. in the comment (*Life*, ii. 465) on Pusey's extraordinary self-persuasion that Newman's then imminent secession would be a response to a 'special call' analogous to 'the mission of Jonah to Nineveh.' This fancy, we believe, was the short-lived offspring of a well-nigh prostrating sorrow; but, at any rate, it was hardly a good specimen of 'the logic of the heart.' Nor, again, is it fair to say that Dr. Symons, as Vice-chancellor, 'told Pusey that he was wanting in some part of elementary morality' by way of comment on a letter in which Dr. Symons wrote, 'I cannot but fear that your authority may tempt others to a conduct which would *in their cases*' (the italics are his own) 'involve the sacrifice of moral integrity' (iii. 56).

touching and beautiful to observe how sedulously for the most part he postpones them to the obligation of keeping back nothing that is pertinent and true. The reader is thus informed of the existence, in Pusey's mind and disposition, of certain limitations, as we might call them, which materially detracted from his qualifications for the arduous post of an ecclesiastical leader—a post, be it added, which was 'thrust upon' him by events.<sup>1</sup> His hopefulness, like his affectionateness, was in one respect his strength, in another his infirmity; the terms 'sanguine' and 'sanguineness' occur fourteen times in the second volume, and twice within forty pages of the third. We hear of his 'taking every man's language literally,' a habit which proves at once that he lacked the safeguard of a sense of humour;<sup>2</sup> we find him 'blind to what was going on,' perseveringly 'shutting his eyes' to facts that are 'unwelcome' (such as Newman's slow-sure Romeward drift)—deficient in tact, insight, foresight, and even in ordinary perceptiveness<sup>3</sup>—falling into 'errors of judgment,' taking steps 'wrong' or 'not justified,' inviting misconstruction by a *sancta simplicitas* which was certainly not *φρόνησις*, and which showed how little (as he himself acknowledged) he

<sup>1</sup> 'I never essayed . . . to be a leader of a party . . . I never sought (it seems to myself strange to have to deny this) to gather persons around me' (*Letter to the Bishop of London*, p. 246).

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Liddon affirms (ii. 220) that he was 'by no means without that sense.' We admit it if the phrase is applied to his quaint rendering of the story of the Manichee and the flies, to sarcasm about 'the world' 'bowing God out with all courtesy,' or to such grim weird irony as must have thrilled a London congregation when the preacher put Pharisaism into familiar modern garb, or translated Luke xvi. 22 into the language of the newspapers: 'We regret to learn that Dives was taken ill in the midst of a splendid and select circle . . . and died at an early hour this morning.' Then, 'Alas, Dives! who would be of thy party now?' (see *Univ. Sermons*, pp. 210, 404; *Lenten Sermons*, pp. 155, 29). But one who in conversation 'sternly repressed all humour' (iii. 105) was not likely to cherish that perception of the absurd or the incongruous which so often keeps men from practical blundering. If Pusey had possessed it, for instance, he would not have gravely insisted on sacrificing, in translations of the Fathers, the English idiom to the Latin or Greek, because language (in the originals) was so sacred (*Life*, i. 442); nor would he have elaborately defended the spiritual use of the word 'inebriated,' in pure disregard of its English associations, because Latin Fathers, or the Vulgate, had used the verb *inebrio* to convey the original idea of religious transport (*ib.* iii. 339; *Letter to the Bishop of London*, p. 208).

<sup>3</sup> The strangest instance of this occurs in *Life*, ii. 22, 85. He had to be warned by a foreign friend (Tholuck) of the danger of allowing his 'delicate wife' to spend long hours in the Bodleian over the collation of Dante MSS. He also encouraged her to work at collations of St. Augustine and St. Cyprian, 'though in very weak health' (ii. 22).



knew of the minds and ways of men.<sup>1</sup> It is not only right to take note of these peculiarities, but it helps us to appreciate the true greatness of his character, to understand how, by degrees, after many a seeming discomfiture, he won for himself, without wishing to win anything, that commanding moral position among Churchmen which he retained until his death in 1882. He 'gat not the land in possession' through the qualities which make up religious statesmanship, through quick or subtle discernment, through versatile self-adaptation, through the accomplishments of a public speaker,<sup>2</sup> through artistic merits as a writer,<sup>3</sup> or through any form of popular talent, but through downright spiritual force, through the unmistakable purity and single-mindedness of a life which was really spent in walking with God. In him there was what he once called his only gift—a native 'energy' which nothing could tire out, and which Dr. Liddon calls 'incessant and inexhaustible'; there was a strength of will which massively bore down opposition, and repeatedly—in Keble's case<sup>4</sup> not always fortunately—constrained less resolute minds to follow his lead; there was, moreover, a swing of impetuosity which at times gave glimpses of the old Adam, while it helped to carry him over barriers which would have daunted natures less enthusiastic; but the normal tone of his life was so unearthly, 'his thoughts, feelings, motives' were so habitually governed by the sense of 'God's encompassing closeness,' that men found it impossible not to think of him as a saint. And thus, as Dr. Liddon expressed it when preaching at Liverpool for the Pusey memorial at Oxford,<sup>5</sup> 'in dark days, when hearts were failing, and friends were straying away from the fold of the English Church, and beckoning him to follow, whilst a vast mass of obloquy and misrepresentation, taking every shape that could wound a sensitive and affectionate nature, fiercely bade him begone' (as the volume

<sup>1</sup> See *Life*, iii. 154, as to writers for his projected 'Commentary.'

<sup>2</sup> Compare the account of his 'defects of manner' as a preacher, which is given in connexion with his first sermon on 'Absolution' (*Life*, iii. 60), with a similar passage in Mozley's *Essays*, ii. 153, relating to his 'condemned sermon.' But 'sometimes, when deeply moved, he could express himself in public 'with force and clearness' (*Life*, iii. 281).

<sup>3</sup> His 'complete indifference to method and style' must always have been matter of astonishment to such a writer as Dr. Liddon (*Life*, i. 31, 144, 218, &c.); and he cannot be wholly excused for a negligence which seriously impaired the effect of nearly all his writings.

<sup>4</sup> If we were obliged to compare these two great servants of God, we should say, judging from this volume, that if Pusey was the stronger, Keble was the wiser.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Liddon, *Clerical Life and Work*, pp. 362, 367.

before us shows with a painful abundance of evidence), Pusey stood forth as the man fullest in public view who did *not* despair of the sacred commonwealth. And therefore men gathered around him, clung as with both hands to this calmly immovable pillar, and drew the strength of quietness and confidence from their knowledge of *his* unswerving trust in the catholicity of the Church of their fathers, although that trust was more usually expressed in terms of a personal assurance that God was still really in the midst of her than in controversial exposition of her case. Strictly, no doubt, a subjective confidence, even though entertained by one so holy, could not establish the soundness of the position to which he adhered; but its ascertained existence was enough to give time, and time was just what was needed. The tremulous, feverish uncertainty which had been tossing minds this way and that—the emotional terror, ‘betraying the succours which reason offered,’ and making men ask whether they were not, after all, outside the historical Church of Christ—the moral and intellectual fascination of Newman’s personality, which had misled so many into ‘trusting in man’ in the sense condemned by the prophet—these things lost more and more of their disturbing and agonizing power; and the result was mainly due to the attitude of one to whom others looked, and were tranquillized while they felt, ‘*He* must have good reasons for his constancy.’

But, as the editors say in their preface to this volume, the further work of ‘converting the authorities of the Church, and the country at large, to the belief that the ground on which the Tractarians stood was solid,’ inevitably required the patient toil of years; and its substantial accomplishment belongs to that later time of Pusey’s life, subsequent to 1858—that evening, rich in ‘mild rainbow tints,’ which closed the long day of sunshine and shower. Dr. Liddon was not permitted to carry on his tale into this comparatively restful period; in his pages we follow Pusey through an ordeal which would have bowed a weaker spirit, and broken a resolve less closely bound up with the very roots of personal religion. The author observes significantly, that ‘almost coincident in point of time with Newman’s departure was the appearance on the scene of Oxford life of the gifted prelate who was destined to have many and various relations with Pusey in the years that followed’ (iii. 33).

The episcopate of Samuel Wilberforce began in November 1845, when he was probably over-young for a post so difficult as the bishopric which Dr. Bagot had gladly exchanged for

the less exacting see of Bath and Wells. We need not refer to his mismanagement of the Hampden case in 1848. He was also theologically in a transition-state, and the standard of High Churchmanship which he ultimately reached<sup>1</sup> might have been attained more easily and more equably but for stumbling-blocks which Pusey himself, most unintentionally, had done something towards piling up in the road. In order to be intelligible we must go back to 1836-7, and observe that Pusey's *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism* was originally published in the form of three *Tracts for the Times* (Nos. 67, 68, 69). Wilberforce, then merely rector of Brighthelm, was startled and repelled by the second of these Tracts;<sup>2</sup> and those who look into it will probably admit the force of Hugh Rose's criticism, that it applied to the 'grievous' sins of persons who had been baptized in infancy what Scripture (Heb. vi. 4 ff., x. 26 ff.) and the Fathers had said about such sins in persons who had been baptized as adults; whereas there was a momentous difference between the two cases, in that 'infant baptism does *not* presuppose a moral choice which is repudiated by post-baptismal sin.'<sup>3</sup> Pusey, in fact, was not given to discriminating when he had before him the words of 'the Fathers';<sup>4</sup> in preparing what has been called his 'condemned sermon,' he never asked himself whether the language of a time prior to Eucharistic controversy was as such the fittest for presenting Eucharistic doctrine to Eng-

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Church Quarterly Review*, x. 234, with a remarkable letter from Mr. Gladstone to Keble, quoted in the *Life*, iii. 324. And see *Life*, iii. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Compare *Life of Pusey*, iii. 310, with *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, i. 153, 311. In the third Tract, No. 69, Pusey lays stress on (1) a real affinity between the Calvinistic view of Sacraments and the Zwinglian, as higher and lower forms of the same theory, and (2) the different senses of 'instrument' or 'effectual sign,' as used by the Calvinistic school and by the English Church in her Articles.

<sup>3</sup> *Life of Pusey*, i. 352. T. Mozley, in his *Reminiscences*, ii. 146, says that he 'heard Pusey's great sermon on Heb. vi. 4, &c., the key note' of which 'was the word "irreparable";' and that 'S. Wilberforce,' soon afterwards, 'made a public protest against' it. This is a difficulty. Wilberforce's objection, as he himself says, referred to the Tract; and there is no record of any such sermon. T. Mozley's memory was not always trustworthy.

<sup>4</sup> One drawback to his large volume on the *Real Presence* is the non-recognition of different types of thought among different Fathers. Clement of Alexandria, for instance, did not treat the subject like the two Cyrils; and St. Augustine's language has peculiarities which are not always understood. It was Dr. Jelf's advice which kept Pusey from reiterating his Eucharistic teaching in the 'language of the Fathers' when, in February 1846, he preached before the University for the first time after his suspension (see *Life*, iii. 65).

lish minds in the nineteenth century, wholly unfamiliar with the Patristic standpoint, and rendered sensitive by the strife which had grown out of Roman exaggeration.<sup>1</sup> And so, in regard to Baptism, he had accumulated Patristic sayings without any attempt to estimate their practical value in reference to an altered state of affairs, or to define the character of the sins to which they should apply;<sup>2</sup> and had practically told English Church people that their infantine admission into the Church had guaranteed to them, on *true* repentance for subsequent falls, 'a right to Christ's all-prevailing intercession,'<sup>3</sup> but that for them the hope of pardon was only 'not cut off,' and the 'light' held out to them, though 'sufficient' to show them the 'path,' was 'not bright or cheering.'<sup>4</sup> Can we wonder that men asked, Is *this* the atmosphere of the Gospel? or that when Wilberforce came to the see of Oxford he retained the impression of mistrust which he had received some eight years before? In these circumstances Pusey initiated a correspondence with the 'bishop-elect,' confiding to him his own anxiety for minds perplexed by Newman's secession, and acknowledging that Wilberforce might have been 'surprised, and perhaps pained,' by certain letters of his, recently published, which had dwelt on 'attachment to our own Church' without 'antagonism' to Rome (iii. 41). How could Wilberforce help answering in terms which gave Pusey 'a disagreeable surprise'? But, not being apt at taking a hint, he wrote again with an 'unguarded candour' which, were the issue less grave, might appear comic, but which in fact might better be called tragical. 'So far from retreating from the attitude taken up in the "published" letters to which the bishop objected, he insisted on,

<sup>1</sup> See his strangely guileless words in ii. 309, and the preface to his *second* sermon on the Eucharist (in 1853): 'I suspected nothing, and so I scarcely guarded anything.' The wonder is that he *did* suspect nothing. On the difference, in this respect, between the two sermons, see *Life*, iif. 425.

<sup>2</sup> In the preface to the three Tracts he says that he dares not define it. In Tract 68 (*Scr. Views*, ed. i. p. 81) he speaks as if referring to all 'wilful sin after baptism.' He quotes as relevant Tertullian's description of *exomologesis* (p. 60), and his allowance of only one reconciliation after baptism (p. 68). He did not then allow absolution to be a means of grace distinct from baptism (p. 70). He even spoke of 'the evils of private confession' (p. 61).

<sup>3</sup> *Scr. Views*, ed. i. p. 63. He distinguishes the Fathers' teaching from the Novatian (p. 57).

<sup>4</sup> Pref. to the three Tracts, p. xiv. It is obvious that Pusey afterwards departed very widely from the unevangelical rigorism of this Tract. The *Scriptural Views*, as now published and forming one long Tract 67, do not express it.

if he did not extend it ;<sup>1</sup> he forced on Wilberforce the knowledge that he was 'maintaining, in the abstract, the tenability of a certain position, in which very many were, of not holding themselves obliged to renounce any doctrine *formally* decreed by the Roman Church.'<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Liddon admits that Pusey's 'anxiety to explain the whole position to his new bishop,' though 'single-minded,' was 'somewhat hasty'; that he so expressed himself as to 'excite suspicion,' and to 'increase the anxiety' which Wilberforce felt about this time. On the other hand the bishop, in his *novitas regni*, was unbecomingly prompt to assume the monitory function of the episcopate towards such a man as Pusey, and to lecture him about a 'subtle form of self-will, self-dependence,' and a partisan temper. Self-dependence was a snare against which a young prelate, who could not but be conscious of brilliant cleverness, had special reason to stand on his guard. However, after this 'unhappy correspondence' it was but natural that 'still graver misunderstandings' should arise, especially as to Pusey's 'adaptations' of Roman Catholic books of devotion;<sup>3</sup> and at last, under the pressure of Low Church suspicions, and the bitter pain caused by the meditated secessions of his brother Henry<sup>4</sup> and of Manning, he committed one of the great errors of his life by inhibiting the Regius Professor of Hebrew from officiating in any parochial church of the diocese, except at his native village of Pusey, where, the Bishop was pleased to allow, 'his ministry would be innocent' (iii. 307). The details connected with this 'high-handed and ill-judged action'

<sup>1</sup> 'It was his manner to express himself more strongly as a correspondence grew' (iii. 396).

<sup>2</sup> In the same letter he suggests that the Council of Trent was 'providentially withheld from any condemnation of ourselves, and that our Articles, being drawn up before the Council, were not levelled against it.' Unfortunately the Tridentine decree on the canon of Scripture was promulgated seven years, those on Justification and the Seven Sacraments six years, the decree affirming Transubstantiation two years, and those on Penance and Extreme Unction one year and a half, before the Edwardian Articles, which were ten years prior to the Elizabethan.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Liddon treats these publications as analogous to the currency given by the English Church on different occasions to translations of such books as the *De Imitatione* and the *Spiritual Combat*, &c. (ii. 389). But the latter were isolated acts, not a series emanating from a 'fiercely' suspected individual, who failed to allow for the impulsiveness of the fervent souls for whom he was providing this new food, and for the diversity (well known to Newman) between the English and the Continental temperaments. And he admitted something when he determined 'not to reprint *Avrillon*' (iii. 321).

<sup>4</sup> This was in 1850. Robert Wilberforce did not secede until 1854.

are so painful that, out of regard for a noble memory, we refrain from dwelling upon them. Ere long he showed a disposition to back out, and it cannot be doubted that in after days he regretted the false step into which panic and suspicion had betrayed him, and which moved Keble to tell him, with a delicate and piercing humour, that 'so definite, severe, and unusual a censure on offences so very vague and indefinite—"tones," "tendencies," and the like—*might remind* some of the process of constructive treason in former times, and of the Six Doctors in our own time, whose proceedings *did not answer so particularly well*' (iii. 315). Yet even if the bishop had thus taken a course which observers might liken to 'howling with the wolves,'<sup>1</sup> could he be blamed for thinking, as he did, that 'Pusey was not sufficiently alive to our differences with Rome'? (iii. p. 317). He could not forget Pusey's letters of 1845; he had probably heard, about that time, from Manning that Pusey had adopted a tone towards Rome which 'breathed not charity, but want of decision,'<sup>2</sup> although he was hardly likely to know that when Mr. Gladstone, in 1847, had wished Pusey to 'set himself right with general opinion by some explicit and public statement against Rome, Pusey had given reasons for persisting in his 'present line of *public neutrality*' in regard to her (iii. 144). And in May, 1850, Mr. Dodsworth, for a particular purpose, had published a letter, in which he emphasized a number of Pusey's acts which would be popularly interpreted in a Romeward sense; and this pamphlet had been read by 'high authorities' (iii. 270), and had produced an impression most unfavourable to Pusey, who soon afterwards endeavoured to counteract its effect by his elaborate *Letter to the Bishop of London*,<sup>3</sup> as he had already replied to another pamphlet by Mr. Dodsworth and two other intending seceders by a *Letter to Mr. Richards* on the relation of jurisdiction, in the matter of absolution, to ordination.<sup>4</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> See Trench on *Proverbs*, p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> So Manning wrote to Pusey (August 8, 1845), urging him to 'speak plainly of the broad and glaring evils of the Roman system,' &c. (*Life*, ii. 455). In iii. 286 we have a very acute explanation of Manning's secession as following on a somewhat stiffly Anglican line. He had, while still with us, 'that strict, theoretical conception of law and authority which, within the Roman lines, made him an extreme Ultramontane,' &c. R. Wilberforce, as Keble's insight discerned, was swayed by a 'constant longing to have everything made theoretically square and neat' (iii. 288).

<sup>3</sup> An estimate of this work will be found in *Life*, iii. 297.

<sup>4</sup> This letter bore the characteristically cumbrous title of *The Church of England leaves her Children free to whom to open their Grievs.*



the autumn of 1850, while 'bewildered with distresses,' he yet busied himself, under a sense of duty, in the affairs of Church Unions, and prevailed over what we account to be Keble's better judgment on the question of adopting an anti-Roman declaration.<sup>1</sup> His influence twice defeated this proposal, originally made by Mr. Palmer, the author of the *Treatise on the Church*, who, long afterwards, most generously declared that, in his opinion, Pusey's counsel had been justified by results. Not, assuredly, by *all* results; and was it justified in principle? Dr. Liddon represents Pusey as only resisting 'a plausible policy of protestation and anti-Romanism' (iii. 285), refusing 'to join in those vague popular declamations against the Church of Rome which are the stock-in-trade of Protestant oratory' (iii. 141). But who asked or wished him to do anything of the kind? Mr. Palmer's formula was grave, though stringent: to represent it as an addition to the Articles was to 'talk wildly'; and to call it a new test, which could not 'legally' be imposed on members of the Union, was the merest technicalism, for the position which it took up was familiar and traditional among English Churchmen; in fact, it was inseparable from Anglicanism, for if we do not hold that the Latin Church, as dominated by the Papacy, is wrong in some matters of deep religious moment, and requires unlawful terms of communion, why do we stand aloof from her? And Dr. Liddon has told us<sup>2</sup> that Pusey himself, as early as 1846, after the appearance of Newman's *Essay on Development*, had found himself 'obliged to abandon, or at least to modify, his non-controversial attitude towards Rome . . . to recur to a more adverse position with regard to her claims,' in the way of *private* discussion. But if so, consistency demanded that he should do the like in public; and if he thought that Palmer's formula would be taken in too extended a sense,<sup>3</sup> he might have recast its phra-

Against the view (really Roman) that jurisdiction was the delegation of a new faculty, he contended that it was but the regulation of the exercise of powers given in ordination.

<sup>1</sup> Keble at first thought that 'the quiet and true people whom we want to act with us have, after what has happened, a fair claim to a *very moderate* but *quite real* disavowal of Rome. And if there are any who would be scared away by it, first, their adherence must at present be worth very little; and, secondly, they must be rather going on under a false impression' (iii. 276). But Pusey, while disclaiming all wish to 'influence' or 'bias' Keble, made full use of his 'stronger wrist' to bring him over.

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, ii. 503; cf. iii. 204.

<sup>3</sup> Palmer was supported by Dr. Biber, who, Pusey 'believed,' had written 'a large book against Tractarianism' (iii. 278).

seology after his own fashion. He kept throwing out objections to any anti-Roman declaration, not one of which could bear a serious scrutiny. But it is quite obvious that his real underlying motive was personal feeling towards Newman. In the end he persuaded the Union meeting that anti-Roman language would merely be suspected as Jesuitical, and carried his point by the emphatic utterance, 'We must await God's time until this fever of fear subside; or, if nothing else will convince men, death in the bosom of the Church of England will' (iii. 282). A moment's hush was followed by a burst of applause. But although the satisfaction thus testified by his audience was an impressive token of the *ἡθικὴ πίστις* which belongs of right to a saintly character, a few minutes' cool reflection might have shown that a simple declaration of fidelity was not, in reason, sufficient for the purpose, being no sort of proof that the person making it did not deem it compatible with acceptance of an undefined amount of Roman doctrine. Pusey himself would have been the first to contend that a man might 'die in the bosom of the Church of England' on extreme Latitudinarian principles, honestly believed to be consistent with Churchmanship, yet that, none the less, he would morally not be 'of' her. Just five months later, amid the troubles connected with the 'inhibition,' Bishop Wilberforce wrote to Keble, 'I am fully convinced of the loyalty of Dr. Pusey's own feelings towards the Church of England. I have no suspicion whatever that he will desert her'<sup>1</sup> (iii. 312). But, in the bishop's mind, *that* was not the question; and it is obvious that a man may have the most 'loyal feelings' and the sincerest intentions towards his Church, and yet may adhere to her on a wrong ground, and thus be out of place among her ministers. Too many in those days did so account of Dr. Pusey; and for them, therefore, the speech at St. Martin's Hall could be no reassurance. Their mistake was not corrected; the *lapis offensionis* was not put out of their way. In the years immediately following, too many were doomed to go on suspecting and misunderstanding Pusey, and doing him unintentional injustice, to the general detriment of the Church, because of the course which he took in the October of 1850.

In this brief survey we have endeavoured to bring together the main facts connected with what Dr. Liddon calls

<sup>1</sup> It is but justice to Bishop Wilberforce to quote what follows, although it does not precisely touch the issue: 'I believe that a great part of the outcry against him arises from his firmly holding great truths which the Church of England teaches.'

'one of the greatest of the many serious misfortunes under which the Church of England then laboured'—the strain of relations between Wilberforce and Pusey. In the remainder of the space available for us we shall, for the most part, confine ourselves to those features of Pusey's life between 1845 and 1858 which touch directly on the Church history of the period. But following shortly after the account of the commencement of that trouble is a chapter which will attract, we fear, a disproportionate share of attention, and may produce in some minds an impression to be regretted<sup>1</sup>—which, therefore, although it relates solely to Pusey's own personal life, we do not feel free to pass by. It is the chapter on 'Penitence and Confession'; and here it seems apposite to remind our readers that no part of the *Life* had been finally revised by the author, and that presumably the editors have not felt at liberty to omit any portion of what he left in their hands.

A word or two of preliminary remark. Not the least of the many excellences of Dean Church's volume on *The Oxford Movement* is the emphasis with which he repeatedly insists on its moral character. In one passage he says that, 'even more than a theological reform, it was a protest against the loose unreality of ordinary religious morality'; in another, 'the movement was above all a moral one: it was nothing, allowed to be nothing, if it was not this.'<sup>2</sup> And this 'profoundly serious tone,' represented in one form by Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, was especially congenial to Pusey, and pervaded all that he wrote or said. His preaching, in particular, was supremely calculated to burn into the hearers' minds one solemn, far-penetrating fact—so often slurred over, explained away, or banished to a remote corner of the field of thought by the shallow, easy-going laxity which indisposes men for any close dealing with their own souls and with their God—we mean the fact of Sin, of its 'awful intimacy,'<sup>3</sup> subtlety, malignity, its essential antagonism to God's law and to man's peace. It would be a calamity if anything in the records of Pusey's life should tend to neutralize, in any quarter, the salutary power of his testimony in this regard. And yet we fear that some who would fain put it aside as over-strained and over-exacting may find an 'occasion' in the account of the penitential rules which he drew up for himself,

<sup>1</sup> The advantage given to bitter and scornful opponents by certain pages in R. H. Froude's *Remains* is still remembered, and the Review of *Life*, vol. iii., in the *Times* of December 27, 1894, goes far to justify our fears.

<sup>2</sup> *The Oxford Movement*, ed. 1, pp. 19, 167.

<sup>3</sup> Dean Paget, *Faculties and Difficulties*, &c., p. 184.

and which—by considerable importunity—he induced Keble, as his chosen confessor, to sanction with some reserve. He had first asked Keble to give him some such 'rules.'

'I hardly know what I can do just now in a bodily way, for nourishment I am ordered; sleep I must take when it comes; cold is bad for me; and I know not whether I am strong enough to *resume the hair-cloth*. However, I hope to try. But I should like to do something because I am bid' (p. 99).

Keble demurred: 'he thought that the troubles of the time were "providential modes of real penance, supplying the want of more direct and outward penances."' Then Pusey asked Keble to hear his confession; but in writing on this subject he grieved Keble's heart by professing himself 'unworthy' to call him friend. It is strange, yet it is characteristic, to see Pusey thus humbling himself in words and yet refusing to take Keble's hint against self-chosen inflictions.<sup>1</sup> No, 'he must have some definite prescription;' he forces the hand of his director. 'Hair-cloth I know not how to make pain. . . . I would try to get some sharper sort. . . . I think I should like to be told to use the discipline' (*i.e.*, in the technical Roman sense, the scourge, p. 100).

The next page gives us some further account of the 'rules' which (somewhat reversing the natural order) he asked his spiritual guide to authorize after he had made confession at Hursley. Some of these are excellent. As to others, one asks whether Pusey could have really supposed that his Master and Saviour would be better pleased with him, more ready to accept and bless him, if (besides observing the fast days of the Church) he 'always wore hair-cloth by day unless ill,' always 'used a hard seat and a hard bed, never wore gloves or protected his hands, kept his eyes down when walking,'<sup>2</sup> except for the sight of nature, ate his food penitentially, drank cold water at dinner, as only fit to be where there is not a drop "to cool this flame," and never smiled, except with children, or when it seemed a matter of love.'<sup>3</sup> Towards the end of the chap-

<sup>1</sup> Yet in the next year he could write, 'One must not choose one's own chastisements' (*Life*, iii. 134).

<sup>2</sup> This was the habit of Peter of Alcantara (Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, October 19). Pusey shows his appreciation of beauty in a splendid passage of his *University Sermons*, p. 398.

<sup>3</sup> Keble 'hesitated' (we are told) on this point, as he did about 'the discipline.' As usual, he stated his opinion in terms of inordinate diffidence: 'I should not be honest were I not to confess that I cannot yet reconcile myself to the not smiling. Is it not a penalty on others more than on oneself?' We are told (in i. 441) that 'Pusey would say in later years, "If you want to get anything in the way of plain counsel from dear J. K.,

ter we are assured that his 'rule of life was for himself; no mistake could be greater than to suppose that he recommended it for general use.' But is there no mistake in supposing that 'it was suited to his own case'? We are told that it was 'made under the Apostle's guidance' in 1 Cor. ix. 27. But surely that passage refers to self-training as such, to methods of subduing the flesh to the spirit in the Christian combat with temptation;<sup>1</sup> whereas Pusey seems primarily to have aimed at *self-paining* by a series of voluntary penalties, the severer the better. Pain, on this view, becomes valuable *per se*, because it is not really discipline, or the moral education of the character, but mere and simple penance, which is the object.<sup>2</sup> Is this what St. Paul meant? Is it not more like that 'unsparingness to the body' which in Col. ii. 23 he classes with will-worship, and pronounces to be 'not of any value'? and has not the history of Christendom informed us that wherever asceticism of *this* type has been encouraged, the notion that such invented pains are somehow expiatory has all too naturally slipped in?<sup>3</sup> We, for our part, believe that what we must call this superstitious phase of Pusey's mind was the outcome, in part, of special circumstances (such as the severance from Newman, and a subsequent severe illness), and, in part, of that extreme view of post-baptismal sin which he had set forth in 1836, and which probably led him in 1839 (in spite of warnings by Newman and Keble<sup>4</sup>) to look on his wife's death as a punishment for his own sins, and to adopt a rigid self-seclusion,<sup>5</sup> which had effects in several practical mistakes, and was anything but likely to correct a morbid condition of mind. It has been said that in one part of his life the fear of God, with him, became 'terror.'<sup>6</sup> This is

you really must be on your guard against his humility." How came he, then, not to understand that Keble was, in fact, dissuading him from extremes?

<sup>1</sup> 'When the lower, though necessary, parts of man's nature become insubordinate . . . they must be suppressed, *lashed back* again to their proper place. . . . What Paul says is that he . . . fought his body' when it revolted, 'and made it his servant instead of his master,' &c. (R. W. Dale, *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, p. 82).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Alban Butler (October 4), on Francis of Assisi's 'extraordinary love of penance,' meaning voluntary austerities; and October 15, Teresa's 'love of penance,' &c. Properly speaking, such inflictions are *not* forms of 'asceticism,' which means self-training.

<sup>3</sup> Eg. see Alban Butler, March 8, on 'St. John of God.'

<sup>4</sup> See *Life*, ii. 97.

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Liddon says that 'Pusey's solitary life' was an 'example,' like that of 'the Baptist' (iii. 111). But the Baptist had not been placed by Providence in the midst of a society.

<sup>6</sup> *Quarterly Review*, July 1894.

surely an overstatement; yet it is evident that religious fear, in him, was *then* too little relieved by a consciousness of the Divine Fatherhood; and all along he seems to have hardly realized the peril of that one-sided insistence on authority, rule, prohibition, the suppression of free instincts (as if liberty were certain to be abused), which is ingrained in the Roman system, and has given a twist to its *ethos*. However, the excess to which he at one time carried fasting was reduced by medical authority, and by the experience of a physical breakdown; as his life grew less troubled he became habitually cheerful, or even 'capable of bright and hearty joyousness';<sup>1</sup> and Dean Stanley was known to say that 'one of the most beautiful things on earth was—Pusey's smile.'<sup>2</sup>

One of the heaviest of his trials between 1846 and 1852 was the complex disappointment of his hopes for St. Saviour's, Leeds, the church which he had built at great cost in the name of 'a penitent,' meaning himself, though in correspondence referred to as 'Z.' The first part of the story, down to the dedication in the autumn of 1845, has been told in our number for January 1894. The second begins in November 1846, when Dr. Hook, whose support of the scheme had all along been 'hesitating and changeable,' took alarm at the tone of the clergy of St. Saviour's, and began to express himself to Pusey with a violence and dogmatism which might well be called portentous,<sup>3</sup> and which, being the outflow of alarm and excitement, amount to a proof that he was *not* a strong man. Yet much allowance must in equity be made for one who really differed from Pusey as to the purport of the English Church's appeal to antiquity,<sup>4</sup> who knew that a strong Low Church force in Leeds was watching to seize on any pretext for denouncing his own work, and who also, being able to 'take the measure of men more accurately than Pusey, was better informed than Pusey' as to the minds

<sup>1</sup> Liddon's *Clerical Life and Work*, p. 363. Between 1860 and 1870 Pusey sometimes even entertained guests at dinner.

<sup>2</sup> In one letter to Stanley Pusey writes, 'Thank you for the kind close of your letter. *All kindness and loving feeling is a treasure in this world of pain*' (*Life*, iii. 391).

<sup>3</sup> See *Life*, iii. 114, 120, 123, 125, 128. No Romanist could fling about the terms 'heresy' and 'heretic' more freely than did Hook in one of his fierce moods. But this raises a serious question. Is it right to put on permanent record such ebullitions of an excitable temper, contained in letters never meant for publication? Would it not have been better to give only the substance of this correspondence? And would not Hook's great services to religion and the Church have made such a course specially befitting?

<sup>4</sup> See this difference stated in *Life*, iii. 120.



of Mr. R. Ward and Mr. Macmullen, whom Pusey believed to be in no danger of Romanizing. Yet the vehement intolerance, as Pusey calls it,<sup>1</sup> of Hook, and the persistently chilling or even repellent attitude of Bishop Longley towards St. Saviour's,<sup>2</sup> may well be thought to have 'precipitated' the catastrophe. All the priests put under this informal ban—'with one noble exception,' Mr. H. F. Beckett—'yielded to the temptations' which such a situation involved, and joined the Roman Church. The first of these secessions took place in 1847, the last in 1851; but 'the mass of the communicants were loyal,' and Pusey, amid all his grief, must have had the further comfort of remembering that he had never returned bitterness for bitterness. If, as Dr. Liddon tells us, Hook in after years spoke of Pusey as 'that saint whom England persecuted' (iii. 368), he may well have numbered among other tokens of true sanctity the grave refined calmness, the measured affectionate remonstrance, the supernatural humility and gentleness, with which his own rude and turbid wrath had again and again been turned aside.

Two chapters of this volume exhibit Pusey in his relation to Sisterhoods. We see how much he did to root in the English Church an institution which, at its first appearance, was bound to excite no little suspicion in the average English mind.<sup>3</sup> Pusey was remarkably cautious in the tentative measures, 'the beginning of a series of experiments,' which established a community of devoted women, in the first instance, at 'Park Village West,' in London. This was a few months before Newman's departure. Soon afterwards Pusey was consulted by more than one clergyman, who 'thought that he might "start a sisterhood" just as he would institute a coal club' (iii. 32). He very wisely answered that such a notion was 'an amiable mistake'; he knew that in order to live healthily, the plant must grow spontaneously—as he would say, under the 'drawings' of God. But some years later, anxieties thickened around the restored institution.

<sup>1</sup> Yet even here he inserts a 'forgive me' (iii. 124).

<sup>2</sup> See also the account of the bishop's 'court of enquiry' (iii. 361). This was in the second stage of the troubles. Dr. Liddon observes that there were faults on both sides (iii. 359).

<sup>3</sup> In speaking of religious celibacy Dr. Liddon says, 'Bishop Andrewes, in his well-known *Devotions*, gives thanks for the Virgins, flowers of purity, celestial gems, brides of the Immaculate Lamb' (iii. 3). But this passage is not in the *Greek Devotions*, which alone are certainly genuine; see Mr. Otley's *Bishop Andrewes*, p. 185. In spite of patristic warrant, we more than doubt whether the collective Church's title, 'spouse of Christ,' should be applied to any individual woman devoted to religious celibacy.

'Probably he had hardly realized the gravity and intricacy of those questions—often involving delicate family relations—which he would be called upon to settle . . . nor the difficulty of guiding and restraining the emotional and sensitive characters with whom he would be brought in contact;'

and so, 'with his unworldliness and simplicity, his overwhelming sense of Divine guidance' and of the sovereign claim of a true vocation, and his indifference to 'misconceptions and gossip,' and also to 'social conventionalities,' he sometimes made unfortunate mistakes, and became, 'for years, the subject of all sorts of imputations, the result of excited religious animosity acting upon and exaggerating imperfect information' (iii. 187). Of course it was no new thing for a holy man—such as were Hooker and Wilson—to be made a mark for scandalous attacks of this base kind. And by Pusey, probably, they were but half heard, and not half attended to. He threw his whole heart into the works of mercy, corporal and spiritual, carried on under Miss Sellon at Devonport; he rejoiced when Bishop Phillpotts, with a courage that no other English prelate, in 1849, would have exhibited, inquired into some charges brought by local Low Churchmen against that Sisterhood, and ended by expressing his 'unmixed admiration' for Miss Sellon and her work.<sup>1</sup> But it has always been understood that Pusey himself got into difficulty with some of his old friends by his enthusiasm for Miss Sellon. They did justice to her as a 'heroine of charity'; but they declined to take her altogether at his estimate, and exalt her into a mother in Israel.<sup>2</sup>

The Gorham controversy, which broke out on Bishop Phillpotts's refusal to institute Mr. Gorham to a benefice on the ground of his denial of Baptismal Regeneration, exhibited Pusey in an aspect for which those who had been startled by the first form of his treatise on Baptism could hardly have been prepared. He regretted the course taken by the Bishop of Exeter:

'He thought that Mr. Gorham might possibly have been won

<sup>1</sup> One sees what advances have been made since that time, when the bishop is reported to have wished 'that the cross and flowers had not been placed on the altar in the oratory. *But ladies were ladies*' (iii. 198).

<sup>2</sup> A remarkable article on 'Miss Sellon' in the *Christian Remembrancer* for July 1852 never once mentions Dr. Pusey, but observes that Miss Sellon had, upon her own authority, intensified her sisters' obligation of obedience to herself. Bishop Phillpotts is quoted as telling her, in his capacity of Visitor, that she had altered the fundamental terms of her institution without even consulting him. Pusey ought surely to have kept her from incurring such a rebuke.

by kindness, but that he would only be exasperated by law.' He 'would have let Mr. Gorham alone, in the hope that in time he might be converted, as others had been converted, to an acknowledgment of the truth' (iii. 204, 217).

If in this we see a touch of his 'sanguineness,' must we not also admire his generous equity? He puts the best construction on the language of the 'Evangelicals.'

'The majority of those who in words impugn the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration are really contending against something else; e.g. against the belief that a person, having been baptized, must necessarily be in a state of grace. Others define regeneration to be that from which a person cannot fall,' or 'by regeneration mean conversion.' 'If Mr. Goode means that an adult . . . may require a solid and entire conversion, notwithstanding the gift of God in Baptism, no Christian instructed in the first principles of the faith would contend with him.' 'Many, not the least devout and earnest of the so-called Low Church, are not opposing the truth of Baptismal Regeneration, but an untrue imagination of it,' being 'anxious chiefly to secure' such 'points' as 'that it does not avail to a man's salvation to *have* received the Sacraments, if he is no longer living as a child of God,' &c. (iii. 218, 227, 236, 262, 264).

One is reminded of St. Athanasius in his relations with the Semi-Arians. Pusey is here a splendid example of the combination of exact orthodoxy with equitable discernment; he can look through words into ideas, and allow for the difference between a wrong sense put upon a term and an intelligent rejection of a truth.<sup>1</sup> And so, while contending earnestly and elaborately that Mr. Gorham's own view about regeneration by a 'prevenient' grace was in effect a contradiction of an article of the Nicene Creed, he yet preferred, in a proposed restatement of the doctrine, after the Privy Council's decision against the bishop, to emphasize

<sup>1</sup> When Lord Shaftesbury, in May 1852, publicly denounced 'Tractarianism' as 'having a bond of union with infidelity, in opposition to Evangelical sentiments,' Pusey, in a letter which ought to have made the accuser ashamed, said 'that it had been the desire of all who would be entitled Tractarians, as it had been his own, to point out, both in public and in private, what we have in common with Evangelicalism. . . . We have wished not so much to oppose Evangelicalism as to supply its defects. All its positive teaching almost is ours also. . . . We have wished to teach all the fundamental truths which it, too, teaches, and to supply what was wanting to it,' &c. Such was consistently his tone. And as to Dissent itself, 'he was careful not to obscure any of the deficiencies of faith or of practice which belong to systematized Puritanism; but he gladly recognized the amount of revealed truth to which many of the separated bodies give their witness, and was painfully aware that their dissent is largely due to the shortcomings of the Church in past generations' (iii. 373).

that aspect of the doctrine, 'the remission of original sin to all infants in and by baptism,' on which he believed that the majority of Evangelicals would be substantially at one with High Churchmen, and, by holding to it, might be led onward. He bore to be taxed with 'temporizing,' to be suspected of drawing back from the defence of sacramental verities, on the part of men like Mr. Maskell and Mr. Dodsworth, who, as he expressed it, had 'a marked eagerness to find all wrong in our Church,' and then to find excuse for deserting her.<sup>1</sup> It was hard upon him, of all men; but he kept his temper unruffled and his trustfulness unshaken; he was never on any occasion more nobly and beautifully himself. The action of the Privy Council inevitably forced on Churchmen a new consciousness of the dangerous working, under gravely altered conditions, of what *had* been the 'royal supremacy' of a personal monarch, presumably in sympathy with the Church;<sup>2</sup> but he uttered no war-cry of 'To your tents!' no passionate anathema against 'Erastianism'; he did, indeed, in one speech point to a contingency in which 'establishment' would have to be surrendered, in order that 'spiritual loss' might be averted; but when Maskell argued that any court of appeal, even if clerical in its constitution, would be, in a Churchly sense, incapacitated if it derived its commission from the Crown, Pusey set to work at a book on the *Royal Supremacy*,<sup>3</sup> in which he brought out the extent to which Christian emperors had acted as 'guardians' of the Creed or the canons, and contended that if the Crown were to 'move' bishops (as he wished) to decide spiritual cases on appeal, it would be only 'putting into motion a jurisdiction

<sup>1</sup> Such men 'had been disposed to see in the decision of the Privy Council a sign from heaven, bidding them no longer to remain within the English Church' (iii. 255). They argued back from it to the illegitimacy of the position which the Church had adopted at the Reformation (*ibid.* p. 238).

<sup>2</sup> 'Were it the *Queen's* supremacy,' wrote Keble to Pusey, 'we could bear it better, for the Queen is a catholic Christian; but this is a restraint of her supremacy by . . . the House of Commons, who may be anything' (iii. 245). So Pusey: 'The characteristic of the influence of Christian monarchs upon the Church, when legitimately carried out, has been that they have exercised the authority given to them by God, according to the rules given by God to the Church' (*Royal Supremacy*, p. 101). Compare Dean Church's invaluable pamphlet on *Church and State*, p. 13, on the two conditions of royal 'visitatorial' power in Church matters as recognized by the Church; it was to reside in 'a real king, understood to be . . . a Churchman,' and to be 'exercised according to the Church's own laws.'

<sup>3</sup> The title was *The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority, but limited by the Laws of the Church, of which Kings are Members.*

existing independently of itself, derived by the several bishops from their sees' (iii. 259). But while one appreciates the historic interest of this fragmentary work, it must be admitted that the actions of emperors such as 'Theodosius, Justinian,' or Charles the Great are not in any serviceable analogy with the action of civil judges under a 'démocratie royale,' when the bonds between Church and State have been so much relaxed by the religious divisions of the country. What can be said is, that they furnish precedents for such a 'supreme governorship' as was claimed by Elizabeth or by Charles I.

Our space is nearly exhausted, and this article must draw to an end. We must pass over several scenes in which Pusey is more and more of a chief actor. Much might be said of his University life, his designs for the 'extension of University education,' his warm support of Mr. Gladstone's candidature for the representation of Oxford, his elaborate though somewhat one-sided criticism on the 'professorial system,'<sup>1</sup> his curiously chivalrous 'effort to save the Hebdomadal Board' in the reorganization of the University, his vain attempt to resist the admission of Dissenters, his long tenure of a seat in the new Council,<sup>2</sup> where he unexpectedly developed an 'admirable' capacity for business.<sup>3</sup> Or

<sup>1</sup> His book on *Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline* was a plea for tutorial and 'catechetical' instruction, and for the collegiate system as morally beneficial. He gives most interesting details as to its good effects in France and Germany. Dr. Liddon quotes (iii. 389) the 'strong and luminous passage' on the relation of all knowledge to theology (*C. and P. T.* &c. p. 212).

<sup>2</sup> One of its happiest results was that 'it completely re-established his old and affectionate relations with the Provost of Oriel,' Dr. Hawkins.

<sup>3</sup> Writing in 1856 of what he calls 'the retrograde movement' in Oxford, Pusey says to Keble, 'Twenty years ago people's minds were earnest, directed towards Theology; now they are turned away from it. The young men (our future clergy) are ignorant in the extreme of the Bible' (*Life*, iii. 410). Since those days the Oxford 'School of Theology' has had a real effect in reviving an interest in sacred studies among undergraduates who look forward to holy orders; and in its curriculum the department called *Biblia Sacra* has a prominence at once statutable and real. Yet we fear that too many candidates for ordination in English dioceses present themselves for examination with far less available knowledge, either of the Bible or of the Prayer Book, than would be exhibited by well-trained pupil teachers in Church schools. We know that this grave defect is matter of disappointment and anxiety to examining chaplains.

It would be something, it would be much, if the younger clergy would profit by the example of those ancient and mediæval clergy who knew large portions of Scripture by heart. Kingsley did not hesitate to tell Cambridge students that 'the early monks had ingrained the minds of the masses throughout Christendom with Bible stories, Bible personages, the great facts and the great doctrines of our Lord's life' (*The Roman and the Teuton*, p. 237). And a young priest or deacon will be

there is the discussion started by the Scottish bishops' 'resolution' in favour of admitting laymen into synods, which drew from Pusey a work on the *Councils*, in which he proves incontestably that bishops alone were constituent members of ancient councils.<sup>1</sup> Or there is the anxiety about the 'Jerusalem Bishopric,' as *then* in close alliance with German Protestantism. Or there is the unfortunate revival of controversy on the Holy Eucharist, 'provoked' by the 'three sermons' of Archdeacon Denison, and rendered specially acute in Scotland after Bishop Forbes, of Brechin,<sup>2</sup> deemed himself bound by his own convictions to devote a primary Charge to this subject—to Keble's regret, it appears, and also in a sense to Pusey's. In the discussion which followed, and out of which grew Pusey's first volume on the *Real Presence*,<sup>3</sup> it was perhaps unfortunate that Pusey thought it necessary to insert between those two words the harshly technical term 'Objective.' The idea of a Presence effected by consecration, and independent of faith (which is a receptive, not creative faculty), might have been guarded, we think, by such a word as 'sacramental.'<sup>4</sup> And he also pressed upon Keble a stringent view as to the relation of 'wicked' communicants to the inward part of the Sacrament, on which point, as a correspondence in the appendix shows, Keble 'inclined' to the opinion which Pusey combated, and which would certainly have the advantage of finding no difficulty in the twenty-ninth Article, though Keble referred rather to 'the sayings of our Lord in St. John vi. 54, &c., and St. Augustine's commentary on them in his Tract upon that part.' Neither seems to have noticed the first exhortation in the Communion Service.

far better qualified to minister to the sick or sorrowful, and to abate or modify prejudices against the Church, if he is found, in preaching, to be really familiar with Scripture, and if, when 'visiting,' he can readily 'bring out of his treasure' the psalm, or parable, or portion of a discourse which will meet the case in hand, and can repeat it without book.

<sup>1</sup> Hefele comes to the same conclusion (*Hist. of Councils*, Introd. sec. 4). But two facts must be also borne in mind: (1) the bishops, in the ancient Church, did most effectively represent their clergy and laity; (2) individual clerics, and even lay communicants, often attended councils, and sometimes materially influenced the decisions. The Scottish prelates' 'resolution' was not carried out.

<sup>2</sup> On the attraction exercised by this admirable prelate, whom Pusey always spoke of as 'the dear Bishop,' and whose death overwhelmed him with sorrow, see *Life*, iii. 448; cf. *ib.* 133.

<sup>3</sup> This was properly a series of notes on the first Eucharistic sermon. On another volume on the *Real Presence* see *Life*, iii. 470.

<sup>4</sup> He had used that term, with 'real' and 'actual,' in a letter to Bishop Wilberforce in 1852 (*Life*, iii. 336).



We shall look with the keenest interest for the appearance of the one remaining volume, which will be purely the work of the two 'editors.' They have deserved well of the Church. If, as we confidently expect, they satisfy the requirements of the most trying part of their task, they will deserve still better.

#### ART. IV.—CREIGHTON'S 'HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.'

*A History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation.*

By M. CREIGHTON, D.D. Oxon. and Camb., Lord Bishop of Peterborough; late Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, &c., &c. Vol. V. The German Revolt, 1517-1527. (London, 1894.)

ALL readers of Dr. Creighton's earlier volumes will welcome with no little satisfaction this further instalment of his great undertaking. Promotion to the episcopate, with its heavy burden of pressing and absorbing cares, has too often in the annals of English literature cut short work of exceptional promise, and left only a splendid torso to testify to the grandeur of what, under other conditions, might have been. How much of the volume before us was practically complete before Dr. Creighton's summons to the Bench, and how far the new and possibly increasing demands upon his time will allow him to proceed with it, we cannot conjecture, for not one word of preface ushers in the history of the German revolt; and although the Bishop is a master in condensation, the scale on which his work is projected would justify some apprehension about its completion. The period embraced in the volume before us only extends over a single decade, and its three hundred pages are strictly confined to the movement of religious thought in Germany, without reference to the parallel revolt in Switzerland against the inordinate claims of the Roman Pontiff. Are we mistaken in regarding the addition of a long appendix of some eighty pages—nearly a quarter of the entire volume—and consisting of extracts from some newly discovered manuscripts in the British Museum, as a mark of the haste inevitable under the conflicting demands of Dr. Creighton's new position? Such matter seems to us rather of the character of *mémoires pour servir*, than of the mature and well-reasoned summary which we expect at the hands of a learned writer; and when to its

original disadvantage of unrestrained verbosity there is the added difficulty of a language not widely acquired in England, we feel that the author is leaving us to do for ourselves what we have been wont to regard as his own special *métier*. We sincerely trust that we shall not incur the imputation of ingratitude in offering these criticisms. With the present as with the earlier portion of Dr. Creighton's history we have been so unfeignedly charmed that we immeasurably prefer his able direction to the exercise of our own inferior judgment. As the work grows under its author's hands, we recognize a maturer exercise of the high qualities which have marked it from the outset—a singular capacity in massing unwieldy details and selecting such as are typical and of primary importance, a clear grasp of the principles at issue resulting in the most lucid presentation of them, and a nice discrimination in points of no little subtlety, which preserves the author from the sweeping and unjust generalizations of partisan writers.

The successors of Hildebrand in the sixteenth century were heirs to an untenable position, and we cannot altogether withhold our sympathy as we read the story of the desperate shifts by which they strove to retain an authority which was hopelessly moribund. A new world was springing up, and they utterly misinterpreted its tendencies. Pretensions to infallibility and to absolute authority, which had been made respectable by the lofty personal character of Gregory VII. and the sanctity of Bernard, had become ludicrously incredible when wielded by the Italian princes who in the fifteenth century wore the triple crown. In an age, moreover, of very moderate acquaintance with historic truth, forged decretals and 'fictitious' donations passed unchallenged, whose spurious character was inevitably exposed when the light of the new learning was concentrated upon them. Nor was it merely with questions of academic or of purely ecclesiastical interest that the claims of the Papacy were concerned. In the long struggle between the house of Hapsburg and successive Roman Pontiffs Germany had suffered humiliation and indignity which had sown the seeds of hatred that might lie dormant for a time, but would eventually germinate and produce their bitter fruits. Yet so unexpected was the uprising of any serious antagonism to the Papacy that, to use Dr. Creighton's opening words, 'the religious revolt, originated by Luther, fell like a thunderbolt from a clear sky.' The position of the Pope seemed most secure at the moment that it was fatally undermined. Monarchical power was

everywhere consolidating itself in Southern Europe, and kings were the natural upholders of an ecclesiastical form of government akin to, and in many cases invaluable to, their own. The attempt to limit the absolute authority of the Papacy by the action of Councils had proved practically a failure, and Leo was surrounded by officials who bade him disregard canons which did not deserve obedience and would derogate from his dignity. Amidst the growth of new ideas begotten of the revival of classical learning, interest in questions of Church reform appeared in Italy to have died out, and in its place there arose an atmosphere of cultivated indifference, too easy going to attack existing institutions, and disposed to accept them without question as a part of the general culture which alone made life worth living. In Germany, however, the effect of the new learning was widely different, and Dr. Creighton describes in a characteristic paragraph the causes which differentiated its influence beyond the Alps from its results in the Italian peninsula.

'What Italy had gained,' he writes, 'was not so much a system, or a method, as a mental attitude; and it was impossible that a mental attitude should be transplanted and grow up in the same shape as before. Other nations received an impulse from Italy, but they applied that impulse to their own conditions, with the result of producing different types of thought and different views of life. The systematized and logical ideas of the Middle Ages had affected Europe equally, and were current universally. It was otherwise with the subtle suggestiveness of the new learning, which was capable of many modifications and could be applied in various ways. At a time when the movement of external politics was awakening national consciousness, the movement of thought was supplying that consciousness with new modes of expression. Germany was the first country which distinctly admitted the influence of Italy, but it did not, in so doing, absorb the Italian spirit. The new learning won its way gradually through students, teachers, and universities; it was not carried home to the minds of the people by a great outburst of art and architecture, by the pomp and pageantry of princely and municipal life, such as dazzled the eyes of the Italians. It came from above, and won its way by conflict with old institutions and old modes of thought. The result was that it wore from the beginning the appearance of a reforming and progressive system, which proposed new modes of teaching and criticised existing methods. Moreover, in Germany there had been a quiet but steady current of conservative reform in ecclesiastical matters which had created an amount of seriousness not to be found in Italy, and was too powerful to be neglected by the leaders of a new movement. . . . What in Italy was frivolous and superficial, was esteemed in Germany for its practical utility. Culture did not remain as an individual possession: it must

render its meed of service to social improvement. Thus there was a breach between the Italian and German point of view, a breach which neither country clearly recognized, but which prevented them from understanding one another when the crisis came. The Germans had drifted farther than they knew from the sentiment of the traditions of the past, and showed themselves singularly open to the pleadings of homely common sense. The Italians, as soon as they were challenged, abandoned their intellectual indifference and took refuge in the sentiment of the past. The conscientious endeavours of the Germans to amend the old system rendered them, as a matter of fact, more ready to revolt from it than did the contemptuous disregard of the Italians, which rested on moral indifference rather than on intellectual disapproval' (pp. 3, 4).

This extract furnishes, we believe, the true explanation of the German revolt, and unfolds the reasons why the cry for reform in Germany was not so met as to prevent the great schism which rent the Western Church asunder. No great national movement arises without long antecedent preparation, and it is the test of true statesmanship to discern and estimate aright the tendency of obscure and subtle influences which are working towards a change in order so to direct and mould them that they may not result in a disastrous upheaval. But in the earlier years of the sixteenth century the Pontiff's advisers were utterly incompetent to gauge the movement of thought in Germany, and were too self-satisfied to regard with other feelings than those of angry contempt all aspirations for religious or ecclesiastical reform. From the intellectual height of their own superior culture the statesmen of the Roman Court looked down with lofty scorn upon the murmurs of those whom they considered little better than barbarians. On the one side were men conscious of the advantages which the new learning had brought in its train, leading the life of a refined Epicureanism, and naturally content with a condition of things which gave them the cream of civilization in no stinted measure. Why raise needless questions that might disturb the equilibrium of the best of all possible worlds? On the other side were men of serious and earnest purpose, bent on ameliorating a state of society which they felt to be incompatible with the primary requirements of Christianity, but urging their demands with a rudeness of speech and homeliness of life which rendered them of small account in the eyes of the Pope and his surroundings. It was, these Italian ecclesiastics believed, but a renewal of the old cry for Church reform which had been raised so often before, and had died away again—the old, futile cry of Wycliff in England, and Huss in Bohemia, and

Gerson in France, and Savonarola in Italy—the cry for that universal panacea, a general Council and a reform of the Church in its Head and its members, which it was as well occasionally to heed, to soothe, and to evade. It would soon be hushed to sleep again. *Quieta non movere* was the wisest policy, and Luther's brawling would soon cease as had that of yet earlier Reformers.

The two opening chapters of the present volume are devoted to the history of earlier efforts which prepared the way for the great champion of Wittenberg, and helped to make his work permanent. Dr. Creighton traces in them the twofold current of religious and humanistic zeal which worked so largely in Luther's favour. Amongst German Reformers before the Reformation were many good men whose sincerity of purpose and purity of life stand out conspicuously beside their imperfect grasp of the insurmountable difficulties which lay in their path. From the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life there sprang amongst others Johann Wesel, of Groningen, whose teaching on the subject of Indulgences was identical with that of Luther; and after him came Nicolas of Cusa, and Rudolf Agricola and Alexander Hegius, and others whose lives are hastily sketched in. If we cannot gather from such of their writings as have come down to us wherein lay the secret of their influence, we must remember that they lived in the earliest dawn of the new learning, and that they are worthy of no slight praise for having advocated new methods of study which helped to disseminate it and to break up the stagnation which had hitherto prevailed.

But the disciples of the Brethren of the Common Life were not the stamp of men by whom a national revolt against the supremacy of Rome could be successfully inaugurated or sustained, and the torch was handed on to others, who brought its light to bear on a wider class than that of scholars and divines. Foremost amongst those who appealed to this larger audience was Sebastian Brant, the author of *The Ship of Fools*, a work written in the vernacular, and designed to 'apply the teaching of Ecclesiastes, and exhibit sin as folly' (p. 11). The mingled humour and pathos of the subject—the conception of a fleet manned by fools, and sent forth to sail upon life's troubled sea—struck a chord to which the heart of man in every age responds; and the book was so immediate a success that it was speedily translated into Latin and Flemish, into French and English. Its literary merits, indeed, are not of a high order. The original concep-

tion is poorly carried out, and soon dwindles to a single vessel; the voyage is forgotten in describing the crew, wherein one type of fools succeeds another with monotonous reiteration; and the poem degenerates into the merest commonplace in doggerel rhyme. Moreover, the author confines himself to the bare enumeration of existing evils, without suggesting any remedies. Yet, for all this, the *Narrenschiff*, adorned with vivid woodcuts, which made its meaning plain to the most careless reader, despite its literary defects, or perhaps in consequence of them, exerted an influence far and wide throughout the fatherland.

'Whereas in Italy, Ariosto and Pulci had refined the wit of the marketplace, and turned it into laughter at the outworn ideals of feudalism, Brant directed the more serious temper of the northern peoples to a savage recognition of their own helplessness, leading to an inarticulate belief in the power of piety and patriotism' (pp. 11, 12).

We cannot follow in detail the various currents of German life in the middle of the fifteenth century which combine to show how deep and widespread was the movement fermenting in men's minds, and of which abundant illustration is afforded in the opening chapter of the present volume. Dr. Creighton takes a comprehensive view of his duty as an historian, and embraces topics which are too often overlooked by writers on the period of the Reformation. From the Emperor Maximilian downward, through the ranks of nobles and scholars, to the citizens of the larger German municipalities; from the universities, thronged then, as ever, with a mass of eager, sometimes turbulent students, in whom the national temper, largely alien to that of Italy, was strengthened by wider acquaintance with the oppression to which their country had been subjected by the Papacy; from the examples yet surviving of the degree in which art under many forms—the paintings of the Holbeins and Albert Dürer, the rich sculpture and metal work that enriched Nürnberg and Augsburg, Cologne and Innsbruck, the wood-engraving and printing which in their brilliancy of type are the envy of modern typographers—from all these evidences we learn how largely men were conscious of a widening of their intellectual horizon. This spirit of the times was further illustrated by the establishment of numerous universities throughout Germany, sustained for the most part out of ecclesiastical endowments diverted to this purpose, of which no fewer than seven were founded in the last half of the fifteenth century, whilst the first quarter of the sixteenth

witn  
was  
phra

new  
the t  
ultim  
the  
varie  
Chri  
tricts  
to th  
all in  
comp  
not l  
the  
the  
Reu  
most  
intol  
avow  
be c  
Jewi  
faith  
shoul  
was  
them  
perie  
expr  
occa  
logia  
Acc  
natu  
Heb  
inco  
linis  
char  
a fra  
belo  
learn  
opin  
fatal  
univ  
conc  
but



witnessed the rise of nearly as many more. The age, in short, was seething with restlessness which, in Dr. Creighton's phrase, 'wanted a cause, a cry, and a leader' (p. 19).

The first trial of strength between the theologians and the new learning was occasioned by the Reuchlin struggle, and the tactics of the upholders of the Papacy augured ill for their ultimate triumph. The immediate ground of controversy was the discussion of a question which agitated Europe under varied phases for centuries, and which, to the shame of Christianity, is not yet laid finally at rest in its northern districts—the question of the treatment that should be extended to the Jews. Were these obstinate infidels to be tolerated at all in a Christian land, and if so, should they not at least be compelled to forego usury and to hear sermons? Would it not be well to deprive them of their Hebrew books, including the Talmud and the Cabbalah, which sustained them in the obduracy of their unbelief? On these issues Johann Reuchlin—a pioneer in the study of Hebrew, and one of the most learned men of his time—took a firm stand against the intolerance of the persecuting party. Any Hebrew books avowedly directed against Christianity, he admitted, should be destroyed, and their owners punished. But the rest of Jewish literature was not designed to injure the Christian faith. It had been tolerated for fourteen centuries; why should it be suppressed now? The conversion of the Jews was more likely to be effected by a friendly bearing towards them than by a renewal of the persecution which the experience of centuries had proved to be unavailing. The expression of so humane and enlightened an opinion gave occasion to the wildest indignation on the part of the theologians, and the contest speedily waxed fierce and furious. Accusations of heresy and of inclination to Judaism (the natural consequence, as some asserted, of the study of Hebrew) on the one side, were met by retorts of ignorance, incompetence, and immorality on the other. The Reuchlinists were eager to enlist Erasmus on their behalf, but his characteristic timidity shrank from intermingling in so violent a fray, and he stood determinedly aloof. To Reuchlin finally belonged the honours of the combat, for superiority, alike in learning and in sound common sense, and the verdict of public opinion, was in his favour. His opponents could claim the fatal victory of having denounced his works to the chief universities of Central Europe, and obtained from them a condemnation which brought little practical inconvenience, but which gave the quarrel a more than national importance,

until it was regarded as a decisive issue between the old and the new learning. It was the struggle of independent scholarship against a combination of the professional teachers of theology which raised the broad question whether the theologians should define at their pleasure the nature and extent of the supremacy which they claimed to wield over every field of human thought and learning.

We have only space for a hasty glance at the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, which formed so famous an episode in the Reuchlin struggle. The reader will find in Dr. Creighton's pages an admirable account of this amusing work, which condenses the results of recent German investigations, and gives an adequate conception of it. To Ulrich von Hutten is assigned the chief share in a composition whose authorship is involved in no little uncertainty, but whose appearance excited the widest interest and provoked universal laughter against Reuchlin's opponents. It would be a tempting theme to draw out a comparison and a contrast between the serious indignation of the *Letters of Junius*, the delicate and cutting sarcasm of the *Lettres Provinciales*, and the coarse boisterous ridicule of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*: each of which furnishes an apt illustration of the age and the country which produced it. The humour of Hutten and his associates is of the broadest type, and their exposure of their opponents utterly unsparing. At one time the most ridiculous questions of casuistry are propounded. Is it mortal sin to have swallowed a chicken contained in an egg served for breakfast during Lent, or to have taken off one's hat to Jews under the mistaken impression that they were Masters of Arts? At another time absurd difficulties of scholarship are mooted. If a full-blown Master of Arts is called 'magister noster,' should a candidate for the degree be called 'magister nostrandus' or 'noster magistrandus'? One writer records a triumph he gained over Erasmus. He was a licentiate in medicine and had prepared a knotty question for the great scholar on a topic connected with his own science, but the conversation chanced to turn on *Poetry*—namely, on the history and writings of Cæsar—and the wily doctor advanced the following conclusive syllogism against the authenticity of the *Commentaries*. 'Whosoever is busy with warfare cannot learn Latin; Cæsar was always engaged in wars: therefore he could not learn Latin. I think, therefore, Suetonius wrote the *Commentaries* because his style is so like that of Cæsar's.' Erasmus, overcome by so subtle an argument, is silent. Unbounded contempt is expressed for poetry and poets which

are re  
God.  
that  
sand  
becau  
runs  
tion a  
he kn  
than  
which  
up a  
Pope  
in fir  
antag  
party  
as av  
over  
ceal,  
to de  
of sch

T  
pletel  
the or

'N  
the m  
are w  
idioms  
constr  
most l  
a lette  
tamen  
vobis.  
tunc s  
quare  
scribo  
tamen  
quand  
libente  
possim  
cogitar

Nor  
lampo  
of the  
grosse  
Pfeffe  
men

are replete with falsehoods, and consequently must be against God. 'Only the other day,' says the writer, 'some one asserted that there is in a certain province a river which has golden sand and is called the Tagus; and I whistled under my breath, because it is impossible.' Amidst such absurdities there runs a constant anxiety about the suit before the Inquisition against Reuchlin. Who is this Reuchlin? What does he know about Hebrew or about theology? Why, no more than a child. He is as ignorant as a babe in the *Sentences*, which are indeed a hard matter and not lightly to be taken up as men would grammar or poetry. Why should the Pope hesitate about Reuchlin's condemnation? Nothing in fine is omitted which could help to bring Reuchlin's antagonists into contempt and to brand them as 'the stupid party.' Ignorant, besotted, and cowardly, they are depicted as avowedly delighting in sensual indulgence, easily slurring over their own failings which they scarcely attempt to conceal, and yet claiming on the score of prescriptive authority to denounce philology and science, and to control the opinions of scholars and men of learning.

The effectiveness of the attack which its authors so completely adapted to the taste of the day, was greatly aided by the outrageously farcical style in which it was written.

'No translation,' says Dr. Creighton in a note, 'can do justice to the marvellous language in which the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are written. It is a mixture of ecclesiastical Latin and German idioms, exhibiting a disregard for grammatical rules and classical constructions which is most excruciating to a scholar. Perhaps the most ludicrous example of style is the following opening sentences of a letter. 'Valde miror, venerabilis vir, quare mihi non scribitis, et tamen scribitis aliis qui non scribunt vobis ita sæpe sicut ego scribo vobis. Si estis inimicus meus quod non vultis mihi amplius scribere, tunc scribatis mihi tamen quare non vultis amplius scribere, ut sciam quare non scribitis, cum ego semper scribo vobis, sicut etiam nunc scribo vobis, quamvis scio quod non eritis mihi rescribere. Verumtamen oro vos præcordialiter quod velitis mihi tamen scribere, et quando scripsistis mihi tunc ego volo vobis decies scribere, quia libenter scribo amicis meis, et volo me exercitare in scribendo, ita ut possim eleganter dictamina et epistolas scribere: ego non possum cogitare quid est in causa quod non scribitis mihi' (p. 47).

Nor were the authors of the *Epistolæ* content with thus lampooning the scholarship and the theological acquirements of their opponents; they besprinkled their letters with the grossest personal attacks upon Gratius, Hochstraten, and Pfefferkorn. Such violence alienated and alarmed thoughtful men like Erasmus, but the work was received with roars of

laughter, and it helped materially to advance the popularity of the new learning ; whilst the incidents of the Reuchlin struggle, and the final condemnation of Reuchlin by a Papal brief in 1520, aroused the public mind to interest in the deeper questions which Luther was already discussing, and which were to issue in results of the widest importance.

It is a necessity of the limits within which Dr. Creighton's work is confined that he can only treat of the German revolt so far as it immediately and directly affected the Papacy, and this restrains him from entering upon those details in the personal career of Martin Luther wherein so much of the picturesqueness of the Reformer's life consists. His early days as a poor chorister lad and as an almost penniless student ; his awakening to deep personal conviction in so acute a degree that his body was worn to a shadow ; his eager study of the Holy Scriptures found in the library at Erfurt ; his vivid sense of reconciliation at length vouchsafed after passages through the deepest waters of sorrow—these points, which loom out so largely in the biographies of Luther, and which furnish so necessary an explanation of much that is singular in his subsequent career, occupy but little space in Dr. Creighton's pages, as they do not fall within the scope of his purpose. But we are more than compensated for the absence of particulars, which are readily accessible elsewhere, by the author's lucid and discriminating account of the growth of the system of Indulgences, which had so mighty an influence on the destiny of Latin Christianity ; by his admirable explanation of the process by which Luther was led on step by step to the final assumption of a position from which at the outset he would have eagerly recoiled ; by his rapid and masterly grasp of the essential principles which were at stake in the different controversies wherein Luther was engaged, so that the reader is carried intelligently along the course of intricate and wearisome discussions, which, but for Dr. Creighton's guidance, would be almost hopelessly obscure ; and by the admirable running commentary which accompanies the record of the action of either side in the momentous struggle, and which, as it points out the impotency of the Papal Court to abandon an untenable position and the inability of Luther to pause in the rapid and forward movement to which he was committed, draws from the spectacle those lessons of discretion and forbearance which *mutatis mutandis* are applicable in every age. At times, as we read the story of the well-worn controversy with Roman pretension, we light upon a passage from Luther's letters that might seem to have been

penned to meet the very latest utterances from Preston or from Spanish Place, as when he writes :

'You have nothing else in your mouth than the Church, the Church : heretics, heretics. But when we ask for the Church you show us one man, the Pope, to whom you hand over everything without a ghost of a proof that he is of indefectible faith. . . . The one point that you have to prove you avoid by a perpetual *petitio principii*, which you know to be the most vicious form of argument. What you have to prove is that the Church of God is amongst you, and not also in other parts of the world' (p. 118).

The history of the growth of the Papal system of Indulgences deserves fuller study and explanation than it has received at the hands of most Protestant writers. Originally designed only as a remission of penitential acts due to the Church, and held to be available only for the truly contrite, the virtue of Indulgences had been accurately defined, with nice distinction between attrition and contrition, and carefully poised demarcation of the exact penalty due to divine and ecclesiastical law respectively, by great scientific theologians, and specially by St. Bonaventura. Following the analogy of the 'Wehrgeld' in German legal codes, Indulgences passed from a remission of outstanding debts to a commutation of them into money payments. They were extended to the region of Purgatory as the belief in that intermediate state grew more general, and were embraced in the wider powers claimed for the Hildebrandine conception (the term is Dr. Creighton's) of the Papacy, until, at the discretion of the Bishops or the Pope, to join the Crusades or to visit the Eternal City in a year of jubilee was rewarded by a plenary Indulgence with the fullest remission of all sin. 'To this St. Thomas added the logical conclusion that, as Indulgences were given out of the treasure of the Church, they were remissions, and not merely commutations ; they did not depend upon the devotion, the work, or the gifts of the receiver' (p. 60).

Even so hasty a sketch may suffice to convince the reader that the subject is one which bristles with difficulties on its theoretical side, and those who have examined it most minutely doubt whether the system existing in Luther's days is yet understood in all its details. But on its practical side, from which Luther viewed it, there could be no question that injurious misconception prevailed. A personal sense of sin and the sinner's need of reconciliation with God are the rudimentary convictions of an awakened conscience ; and Tetzl's coarse method of dealing with matters so inexpressibly

solemn, and the importance of whose issues Luther knew so intimately, roused his utmost indignation against the thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money. Yet the famous Theses, published October 31, 1517, were not directed absolutely against the use, but against the abuse of Indulgences; were rather an academic discussion of an avowedly open question than an assault upon Church doctrine; and were broached in a tone of genuine humility and of desire for the expression of the mind of the Pope.

It was the misfortune of all the Papal advocates throughout their controversy with Luther to be unable to discern the stamp of man with whom they had to deal, or to comprehend the position which he was occupying. In every demand of his for explanation, even on points generally allowed not to be *de fide*, they invariably suspected an attack upon the Pope's supremacy, and insisted upon unconditional submission. As point after point arose and the field of debate became wider, they displayed singular maladroitness in referring judgment to tribunals obviously tainted with partiality, and in so withholding concessions as to drive their antagonist further from them. Such mistakes might appear unaccountable if we bear in mind Leo X.'s genuine sympathy with the Humanists, his undisguised contempt for 'the stupid party,' and his indifference to questions of abstract theology; but he made the twofold mistake of unduly despising the abilities of the Wittenberg professor and the strength of anti-Papal feeling in Germany. A yet stronger motive for repressive measures existed in the necessities of the Papal treasury, to which the sale of Indulgences contributed absolutely indispensable oblations. Meanwhile the growth of Luther's convictions was advancing with startling rapidity. He describes himself as driven on by an irresistible impulse, and with an audacity that alarmed himself as well as his friends. At the close of the year 1517 he was ready to be silent at the Pope's bidding, and to bow submissively to the Pope's decision. Before another twelve months had passed he writes, 'I rather think the Pope is Antichrist.' His bewilderment is seen in the alternate violence and amazement of his utterances as he studied the Papal decretals and discovered the system of fraud on which they were based. His mind oscillated between fierce denunciation of detected falsity and obedience to erring but established authority. If his ideas were half formed, it was not in his nature to express them by halves.

We may lament Luther's lack of self-restraint, and his unseemly language, but revolutions are not accomplished in



kid gloves, and it did not lie in the mouth of his antagonists to complain of a ferocity which they equalled or surpassed. No doubt moderate men like Erasmus were repelled by his unmeasured invective and withdrew from further inter-meddling with the controversy; and thus irreparable damage was done to a cause which by their adhesion might have been more wisely moulded. No doubt, in the light of after consequences, we must mourn that by a more conciliatory attitude Luther did not do all that in him lay to avert the unspeakable calamity of a great schism in the Western Church. The dilemma was portentous, but the die was cast, and Luther, strong in the consciousness of his own integrity, flashed out the sword and threw away the scabbard. 'I believe,' he urged, 'that I am a Christian theologian, and live in the kingdom of the truth, and therefore am a debtor to the truth not only to set it forth, but to defend it even to death;' and as further investigation revealed the fraudulence and forgery of the title-deeds of Papalism with the foundation upon which a system of extortion for payment for 'Indulgences, Bulls, and other trifles, from the sale of which the members of the Curia gained the means of keeping their harlots' (p. 112), his indignation was unbounded. The issue had been changed in the space of a year from the validity of Indulgences to the supremacy of the see of Peter; and when, before his discussion with Eck at Leipzig, Luther determined to test the Papal claims by the standard of Scripture, he adopted and expanded the line of argument which has substantially been repeated ever since (p. 113).

We have not space to trace even in outline the rapid outpouring of writings with which in the latter half of the year 1520 Luther brought the conflict with Rome to a climax. In his address '*To the Christian Nobility*,' in his work *On the Babylonish Captivity*, in his pamphlet *On the Liberty of a Christian Man*, and, finally, in his last letter to the Pope *On Christian Liberty*, Luther put forth all his powers as a statesman and a theologian, and endeavoured to rally the whole German nation to his support. He had sorrowfully arrived at the conviction that reform within the Church by the action of its own leaders was hopeless, and that even a General Council would be a vain resource unless it were summoned under secular authority and freed from the overpowering influence of the Roman Curia. In his letter to the Christian nobility of Germany respecting the reformation of the Christian estate Luther was at his best, and his qualities and defects stand out in high relief. His fervour and simplicity, his

earnestness and directness, his strong common sense, and his passionate energy of conviction are no less conspicuous than his complete failure as a statesman to grasp the strength and utility of the Church system, rightly understood, from which he was ready to cut himself and his followers asunder. We must beg space for part at least of Dr. Creighton's admirable summary of Luther's position in this appeal, which we commend in its entirety to our readers.

'The striking feature in this document is the lightheartedness with which it contemplates a breach of the historical continuity of the ecclesiastical system. There is no sympathy expressed for old usages, which are treated as though they were stifling the true life of the Christian man. There is no attempt to separate their real meaning from the growths which had gathered round them. Luther shows a decided respect for everything that concerned the civil government—though the reformation of the Empire was as much needed as the reformation of the Church; but for the institutions of the Church he expresses little regard. . . . It had come to this: that the great institution which had fostered the early life of all European nations, and was interwoven with every stage of their history, was now regarded by the awakening aspirations of a new age as a worthless lumberer of the ground. . . . There is not a trace of sentimental attachment: let homely common sense deal with the matter. If only a free Council can be assembled—and Luther does not stop to inquire how it is to be constituted—general intelligence, if once freed from the absurd prepossessions of the past, will easily bring order into the prevailing confusion. The great ideal of the Mediæval Church had disappeared, lost to sight among abuses, frittered into oblivion before the complexity of details. Let men be taught their Bible and be exhorted to do their duty. . . and a new and healthier Christendom will come into being. . . . He is not concerned with ecclesiastical order—that is a matter of detail which may be left to settle itself. It is true that his principle of the universal priesthood of all baptized Christians, applied by itself, reduces ecclesiastical organization to a matter of expediency. Yet Luther did not seem to contemplate any violent change. The Pope even was to remain, not as the Vicar of Christ in heaven, but only of Christ on earth, to represent Him "in the form of a servant," by working, preaching, suffering, and dying; nay, he was still to be referred to, for if we took away ninety-nine parts of the Pope's Court, it would still be large enough to answer questions on matters of belief. Germany was still to have a Primate, Archbishops, and Bishops, though such officers were not of Scriptural institution, but were founded for convenience of rule. What were to be the functions of the Bishops is not so clear; for every town was to elect a pious and learned man from the congregation and charge him with the office of minister; the congregation was to support him, and he should be at liberty to marry; he was to have assistants, several priests and deacons.

These are but scattered hints. There is no attempt to work out a connected system, or to show how it was possible. Luther's purpose was to prove that resistance to the Papacy was not hopeless; there was another and a broader basis of ecclesiastical life, of which he merely sketched the general lines' (pp. 131-133).

While the ideas which thus eventually found expression were still seething in Luther's mind, the death of Maximilian afforded the prospect to both parties of securing a powerful ally in the new Emperor. What the Pope desired was a weak emperor, who should be constantly in need of his support to hold the balance in Italy between France and Spain—a position which his astute Holiness could easily turn to his own personal advantage. What the great body of the German people desired was a strong emperor, imbued with the national spirit, who should maintain the rights of Germany against Italian encroachment, and approach the great questions which Luther and the Humanists had raised with a fair and impartial mind. It is almost impossible to unravel the tangled maze of secret negotiation which Leo carried on simultaneously with all parties, until his agents were utterly bewildered by the contradictory orders he despatched to them. Notwithstanding the industry with which the archives of different Courts have been ransacked of late years, the conclusions of historians are modified from time to time as fresh documents have come to light. What a world of selfishness and corruption stands revealed as all parties in turn—the electors, the competing monarchs, the wearer of the triple crown—exhaust every artifice to wheedle or cajole! What floods of insincerity and intrigue, veiled under professions by which no one is for an instant deluded! What universal falsity, as each in turn but uses words in order to conceal his thoughts, and truth seems to have died out of Christendom! It is a sickening spectacle, this march and counter-march of lies marshalled in turns by the 'Most Catholic' and the 'Most Christian' king, each of whom doubtless distrusted profoundly the engagement solemnly contracted with himself by Leo 'sub verbo Romani pontificis'!<sup>1</sup>

It is difficult to understand how modern disciples of the Roman obedience can read the history of the Papacy during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries without a vivid sense of the injury inflicted on the Pope's spiritual authority through its union with his temporal power. This conviction obtrudes itself perpetually as we learn the straits to which Leo X. and his two immediate successors were reduced in their endeavours

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* p. 95, note 3.

to secure and to strengthen their position as Italian princes. Nothing could well be more pitiable than the display of vacillation and uncertainty, of intrigue and subterfuge—the alternate attitude of half-hearted friend and trembling foe—which the Roman Pontiffs in the period embraced by Dr. Creighton's volume presented in turn to the ambassadors of Francis I. and his great rival. The Imperial election, which eventually placed Charles V. on the throne of Germany, brought the diplomatic skill of Leo to the test; and all the resources of Italian craft were exhausted in efforts to further the choice of whichever candidate would be least formidable to the secular, even more than to the spiritual, pretensions of the Papacy. Dr. Creighton presents us with a graphic picture of the conflicting anxieties by which the mind of Leo was distracted. He was afraid to support or openly to oppose the candidature of either Charles or Francis, as each was already too powerful and close a neighbour to be invested with the additional power of the Imperial dignity. He wanted to have the credit of having aided the successful competitor, and to bargain for some advantage in return for the decisive word which he refused to speak; and even when he ventured to give advice he was terrified because Francis adopted it, and he began secretly to undermine the accomplishment of what he had outwardly professed to desire. Would it not be better, he suggested, that both Charles and Francis should stand aside, and that a German *pur sang* should fill the vacant throne? Would not Henry VIII. of England be a wiser choice than either of his royal brothers? Would Francis guarantee him the restoration of Ferrara to the Papal States? Would Charles promise to bring Luther into submission to the Papal authority? When all the grace of his adhesion had been lost, when all sides felt that they had been aggrieved and betrayed, when the practical impotence of the Papacy had been unmistakably disclosed, Leo made a virtue of necessity, and withdrew his veto upon the election of Charles. In one of his most characteristic pages Dr. Creighton sums up the result of Leo's diplomacy as follows:

'The Papacy, as a political power, was practically helpless; but Leo could not venture to say so, and could not free himself from the trammels of political complications. The Papacy had a right to exercise influence; it had abandoned its claim to influence, and had exercised power. Now its power was gone; but Leo dared not admit the fact. It was impossible for him to revive a claim to influence, because he was steeped in political intrigues. The consequence was that he was placed in the ignominious position of

trying to behave as if he was possessed of power, whereas really his power was gone, and he was at the mercy of pressure from without, which he could not resist. There was little satisfaction in thinking that he had done his best, and had escaped without any practical injury. He felt keenly that the Papacy had suffered severely in the eyes of politicians, and was regarded as a puppet, the strings of which would be pulled by the strongest. Leo had never contemplated the possibility of rising above the political entanglement in which he was involved. He did not attempt to gauge the temper of Germany, or work in accordance with national feeling. He worked by means of subtle schemes, which failed because they had no basis of resolute action. Leo was so fearful of knocking his head against a wall that he forgot that walls might be scaled' (pp. 101-102).

Leo would have been under less apprehension, perhaps, if he had known more intimately the character and convictions of the new Emperor. No man was less likely to be won over to the cause of the Reformation as advocated by Luther and Calvin. In its earlier stages the cry for reform had oscillated between a demand for amendment in the lives of the clergy and a demand for a revision of the accepted rule of orthodoxy, and with the former Charles, in common with many of the staunchest upholders of the Papacy, was largely in sympathy. The scandalous lives of the clergy of all ranks, the evils resulting from the unchecked licence of pluralities and simony, the shameless extortion and venality of the Papal Court, and the perpetual drain of German wealth to Italy, were all vices in whose removal the Emperor had no less an interest than his subjects, and their advocacy placed him in most advantageous accord with the development of national patriotism, which was so marked a feature of the times. But when questions of doctrine were raised, Charles unhesitatingly cast all his influence to maintain the unity of the Church and the decrees of the Councils. He was alarmed at the assault upon all authority, which Luther had unmasked. He was persuaded that there must somewhere rest a supreme authority, and Luther's relegation of it to each man's interpretation of the Bible for himself at once annihilated it. He would not outrage German feeling. He would faithfully observe the safe-conduct granted to Luther, but he would do no more. If Luther would not retract he must be placed under the ban of the Empire as well as of the Church. At length Rome had triumphed, but its victory was barren and short-lived. The singular heroism of Luther at the Diet of Worms had fanned the flame of anti-Papal feeling, and the Pope's envoy wrote: 'Since the Bull of your Holiness and the Edict of the Emperor the number of Lutherans is

increased.' Even then Leo thought it only a theological storm that had burst out suddenly and would in time again subside. It was singular that men who prided themselves upon their political astuteness should have been so blind as were Leo and his counsellors to the imminence of the dangers which beset them. Dr. Creighton points out with his wonted clearness, and perhaps with some exceptional severity, Leo's true character and the reasons which caused his immediate successors to attribute to him a wisdom which he could not justly claim :

'Leo on his deathbed felt that he handed on his office with powers unimpaired and with fair prospects for the future. Posterity adopted his opinion, and looked back upon him as the last of the great Popes before the Schism rent their dominions in sunder. The golden age of Leo X. shone with a lustre which owed its glow to contrast with the time that followed ; and Leo gained a reputation for wisdom, solely because he did not live long enough to reap the fruits of the seed which he had sown. What the days of Edward the Confessor were to our English forefathers, when they groaned under the yoke of the Norman Conqueror, was the age of Leo X. to the bewildered official who found his revenues dwindling away ; to the impoverished citizen of Rome who beheld his city reduced to desolation ; and, above all, to the man of letters who found his occupation gone, he knew not why nor how. The change that came over the fortunes of Italy in politics, in literature, in art, in society, in everything that made up life, was so sudden and so complete that men had no time to analyze its causes. They only looked back with sorrowful regret to the good old times before the crash had come, and treated Leo as the last representative of an age of heroes.

'For, after all, Leo's qualities were those of the epoch to which Italy long looked back as the period of its greatest glory. His father, Lorenzo, had combined the selfish audacity of the condottiere prince with the plausible hypocrisy of the cautious merchant, and had adorned the mixture with daubs of literary and artistic culture. Leo inherited his father's characteristics, somewhat enfeebled by the Orsini strain of his mother. The spirit of adventure was weaker, the open-heartedness of the noble overcame the prudence of the merchant ; the duplicity of the trader was reinforced by that of the Court intriguer. The baser and more vulgar elements were intensified ; the intellectual elements were diminished ; but the greater development of the social and sympathetic qualities preserved the balance for practical purposes. Leo was a lower type of man than his father, but he awakened less antagonism ; he was far inferior to him in intelligence, yet he seemed to form greater plans and pursue greater undertakings. This was because he always had a ready smile and a genial remark, and behaved with the dignity and assurance of one who was born to rule' (pp. 164-5).

Yet the mode of life adopted by the Pope and the wealthiest



of his cardinals was in saddest contrast with that which became the chief spiritual guides of Christendom. Although personally temperate, Leo enjoyed and encouraged portentous feats of gluttony in others, indulged in practical jokes of the coarsest kind, and found cynical amusement in seeing human nature reduced to the lowest level of animalism. Pleasure in its varied forms was the main object of his life, and he pursued it incessantly along the paths which men in their blindness think will lead to it: in every form of sport, in card-playing, in comedies, in profuse liberality and the most frivolous amusements. The richest bankers in Rome vied with each other in extravagance, and the record of entertainments given by Agostino Chigi and Lorenzo Strozzi reads like a page from Suetonius in the reigns of Caligula or Nero. Even their imperial magnificence was barbarous in comparison with the villas and stabling designed and decorated by Raffaele, and, as Dr. Creighton affirms, never since the days of Cleopatra had been such poetry of profusion as when the silver plates and dishes at one of Chigi's dinners to the Pope were thrown, as soon as they had been used, into the Tiber; the astonished guests being ignorant that they fell into nets, and so would be afterwards recovered. Yet the highest madness of luxury was attained by Strozzi, who, in the carnival of 1519, gave a dinner to four cardinals, a number of Florentine friends, two buffoons, and three courtesans. This strangely assorted company was first ushered into a room hung with black, with four skeletons in the four corners, and a death's head, concealing some roast pheasants, on the table. Thence they were conducted to a dining-room, and as soon as food was placed before them there was a shock like an earthquake, and it disappeared. Presently, two spectral forms, resembling two of the guests, flitted through the chamber, and the terrified cardinals slunk hurriedly away. Strange to say, amidst such excesses the cultivation of literature and art became general, and the glory of the Renaissance reached its highest point at Rome during the reign of Leo. The most distinguished scholars entered the Pontiff's services; the greatest of modern artists, Michael Angelo and Raffaele, worked for him in Rome or at Florence; literature in all its branches, even comedy in the full licence of a licentious age, enjoyed his patronage. Libraries were formed, and Greeks employed to collect manuscripts from which the choicest classic authors became the common property of all learned Europe. As some measure of the effect which Leo's encouragement of letters produced, it may be noted that the

names are on record of 120 poets resident in Rome. 'Before such a multitude of bards,' Dr. Creighton writes, 'criticism is reduced to respectful silence.' The forms which the new birth or the new learning took respectively in Germany and Italy suggest a comparison between their greatest representatives, Raffaele and Luther, which is worked out in one of Dr. Creighton's most striking passages as follows :

'The life of Raffaele expresses the best quality of the spirit of the Italian Renaissance—its belief in the power of culture to restore unity to life and implant serenity in the soul. It is clear that Raffaele did not live for mere enjoyment, but that his time was spent in ceaseless activity, animated by high hopes for the future. But his early death on April 6, 1520, was the end of the reign of art in Rome, and the reign of literature soon ceased as well. The foreboding soul of Michael Angelo was more far-seeing than Raffaele's joyous hopefulness. Not the peace of art, but the sword of controversy was to usher in the new epoch. Italy was no longer to be the teacher of the world ; nor was Rome to be the undisputed centre of Christendom, from which religion and learning were alike to radiate forth to other nations. The art of Raffaele is the idealization of the aims of the Italian Renaissance, which in its highest form strove to improve man's life by widening it, and was not concerned with the forms of existing institutions, but with the free spirit of the cultivated individual. It is a strange contrast that, as the star of Raffaele set, that of Luther rose. Both were men of great ideas ; both had a message which has not ceased to be heard throughout the ages. Raffaele pointed to a future in which human enlightenment should reduce to harmony and proportion all that had been fruitful in the past ; Luther claimed a present satisfaction for the imperious demands of conscience awakened to a sense of individual responsibility. Luther lived long enough to know that the power to which he appealed could not be confined within the limits which he had laid down for it, and that the future would be filled with discord. Raffaele's dream vanished into thin air, only to form again and float with new meaning before the eyes of coming generations. That Raffaele's pencil had just ceased to glorify the Papacy when Luther arose to bespatter it with abuse, is a symbol of the tendencies which long divided the minds of men. The ideal of Raffaele was not necessarily opposed to that of Luther. Only the human frailty of impatience, or the base promptings of self-interest, lead men to set futile limitations upon the elements for which they are willing to find a place in their harmony of the universe. Raffaele took the Church as it was, and recognized its eternal mission to mankind—a mission which was to increase in meaning when interpreted by the increased capacity of the human mind. The frescoes of the "Sala della Segnatura" are as much opposed to the exclusive domination claimed by the Mediæval Church, as is Luther's assertion of Christian freedom. But Raffaele spoke in a pagan tongue, with which ecclesiastical authorities were familiar ; and he asked for no immediate

exertion on their part. Luther arose, like some prophet of old, and sternly demanded that they should set their house in order forthwith. It was inconvenient to do so; it was undesirable that authority should be reminded of its duties by individuals, however excellent. So at a time when liberty of thought and opinion was universally practised, the Church suddenly furnished up weapons which had been long disused, and proceeded to crush the man who refused to unsay his convictions at her bidding. The liberality, the open-mindedness, the cultivated tolerance of Leo X.'s Court did not go beyond the surface, and disappeared the instant self-interest was concerned. Men might say and think what they pleased, so long as their thoughts did not affect the Papal revenues. As Luther's meditations led to practical suggestions, he was peremptorily ordered to hold his tongue. Many had been treated in like manner before, and had obeyed through hopelessness. Luther showed unexpected courage and skill, and met with an unexpected answer to his appeal to the popular conscience to judge between the Papacy and his right to speak. When once the revolt was declared, many questions were raised, about which opinions may differ. But the central fact remains, that the authority which bade Raffaele speak, bade Luther be silent. The Church which could find room for poets, philosophers, and artists as joint exponents of the meaning of life, refused to permit a theologian to discuss the basis of a practice which had obviously degenerated into an abuse. Doubtless Leo X. and his advisers saw nothing contradictory in this. The Pope wished to live peaceably, and to do his duty rather better than his immediate predecessors; the theologians of the Papal Court were willing that the theology of the past should be superseded, but not that it should be directly contradicted. In all the list of men of learning who graced the Papal Court there was no one found to understand the issue raised by Luther, or suggest a basis of reconciliation' (pp. 179-180).

The remaining pages of the work before us, full as they are of interest, do but serve to enforce the lesson of these concluding sentences with fuller illustration and further minuteness of detail. The irony of fate has rarely been more forcibly displayed than in the utter helplessness of the two Infallibilities who occupied the throne of the fisherman after Leo, and in the indignities which they suffered at the hands of their nominal upholders. All the genuine worth of Adrian, all the Medicean craft of Clement, were powerless to retrieve a position which had been reared into theoretical omnipotence and practical impotence. A certain pathos attaches to the story of Adrian's endeavours, with feeble but well-intentioned efforts, to cope with evils that only a giant's strength could strangle. But even misfortune has scarce power to invest with dignity the irresolution and duplicity, the shiftiness and cowardice which brought on Clement the crowning misery of the sack of Rome. Henceforth the

relation of national Churches to the Papacy became a question of convenience, and was governed by reasons of political expediency. The German revolt was still unsubdued, and further but as yet unexpected disaster was impending.

#### ART. V.—MR. GLADSTONE ON THE ATONEMENT.

*True and False Conceptions of the Atonement.* By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. *The Nineteenth Century*, September. (London, 1894.)

IN our last number we had occasion to make some comments upon Mr. Gladstone's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for August on the subject of heresy and schism. The same periodical contained in September a contribution in which the distinguished author discussed a question which is no less interesting and no less pressing at the present time than his former subject, and in which still more momentous consequences to the Christian Faith are perhaps involved. No thoughtful mind which has begun to consider theological inquiries can fail either to be attracted or to be repelled by the doctrine of the Atonement. The consideration of it has formed a turning-point in the opinions of many in the present restless period of religious thought. With its truth or its falsity the whole Christian system is bound up.

A reference to this doctrine which was made by a writer of great literary powers<sup>1</sup> as having been a principal factor among the causes which led to her rejection of Christianity forms the starting-point of Mr. Gladstone's article. The circumstances to which its particular form is thus due marks its general character. It is evidently intended to be less a complete theological statement than an attempt to meet certain current difficulties; and its aim is to appeal to those who are, to a large extent, outside the influence of orthodox writings of an ordinary type. To understand it properly the writer's own words must be kept in mind.

'I waive no tittle of the authority which belongs to the established doctrine of the Atonement; but only abstain from modes of speech and argument which could find no possible access to the minds of

<sup>1</sup> See *Annie Besant: an Autobiography*, p. 99. We have read parts of this book with a sense of the deepest pity; but we should welcome, for more reasons than one, information that its circulation is small.

such as follow the methods adopted by the writer of this autobiography' (p. 320).

Mrs. Besant had spoken of 'God' 'accepting a vicarious suffering from Christ and a vicarious righteousness from the sinner.' In defending what he believes to be the true sense of the first phrase Mr. Gladstone puts aside the second; and it is obvious that there is no necessary connexion between the suffering of Christ being vicarious and the non-existence of righteousness in those who are benefited by it. He next repudiates statements, such as are sometimes incautiously made, according to which so long as the debt to God is paid it does not matter who pays it, and points out that in considering the willingness with which our Lord accepted the position of Redeemer it must not be forgotten that the Agony in the Garden shows that this was 'a conditioned willingness,' and that 'He accepted it because there was something deep down in the counsels and in the very nature of the Divine Being which made it indispensable,' or that 'injustice is not the less injustice because there may be a willing submission to it' (p. 321).

After a statement of the truly vicarious character of Christ's sufferings as 'an atonement—at-one-ment—vicariously brought about by the intervention of an innocent person,' and an explanation of the term 'forensic,' Mr. Gladstone lays down a series of propositions which are intended to show the truth of his contention that the Atonement, rightly understood, 'does not involve the idea of injustice' (p. 322). It may be convenient that we should quote the greater part of these propositions.

'1. We are born into the world in a condition in which our nature has been depressed or distorted or impaired by sin; and we partake by inheritance this ingrained fault of our race. . . .

'2. This fault of nature has not abolished freedom of the will, but it has caused a bias towards the wrong.

'3. The laws of our nature make its excellence recoverable by Divine discipline and self-denial, if the will be duly directed to the proper use of these instruments of recovery.

'4. A Redeemer whose coming was prophesied simultaneously with the fall, being a person no less than the Eternal Son of God, comes into the world, and at the cost of great suffering establishes in His own person a type, a matrix so to speak, for humanity raised to its absolute perfection.

'5. He also promulgates a creed or scheme of highly influential truths, and founds therewith a system of institutions and means of grace, whereby men may be recast, as it were, in that matrix or mould which He has provided, and united one by one with His own

perfect humanity. Under the exercising forces of life their destiny is to grow more and more into His likeness. He works in us and by us ; not figuratively, but literally. Christ, if we answer to His grace, is, as St. Paul said, formed in us. By a discipline of life based on the constitutive principles of our being He brings us nearer to Himself ; that which we have first learned as lesson distils itself into habit and character ; it becomes part of our composition, and gradually, through Christ, ever neutralizing and reversing our evil bias, renews our nature in His own image.

'6. We have here laid down for us, as it would seem, the essentials of a moral redemption, of relief from evil as well as from pain. Man is brought back from sin to righteousness by a holy training ; that training is supplied by incorporation into the Christ who is God and man ; and that Christ has been constituted, trained, and appointed to His office in this incorporation, through suffering. His suffering, without any merit of ours, and in spite of our guilt, is thus the means of our recovery and sanctification. And His suffering is truly vicarious ; for if He had not thus suffered on our behalf we must have suffered in our own helpless guilt.

'7. This appears to be a system purely and absolutely ethical in its basis. Such vicarious suffering, thus viewed, implies no disparagement, even in the smallest particulars, to the justice and righteousness of God.

'8. It is not by any innovation, so to speak, in His scheme of government that the Almighty brings about this great and glorious result. What is here enacted on a gigantic scale in the kingdom of grace only repeats a phenomenon with which we are perfectly familiar in the natural and social order of the world, where the good, at the expense of pain endured by them, procure benefits for the unworthy. . . .

'9. The pretexts for impugning the Divine character in connexion with the redemption of man are artificially constructed by detaching the vicarious efficacy of the sufferings of the Lord from moral consequences, wrought out in those who obtain the application of His redeeming power by incorporation into His Church or Body. . . .

'10. And now we come to the place of what is called pardon in the Christian system. The word justification, which in itself means making righteous, has been employed in Scripture to signify the state of acceptance into which we are introduced by the pardon of our sins. And it is strongly held by St. Paul that we are justified by faith (Rom. iii. 28, v. 1), not by works. Were we justified, admitted to pardon, by our works, we should be our own redeemers, not the redeemed of Christ. . . .

'11. I have said that, when the vicarious sufferings of Christ are so regarded that we can appropriate their virtue, while disjoining them even for a moment from moral consequences in ourselves, we open the door to imputations on the righteousness of God. But the epoch of pardon for our sins marks the point at which that appropriation is effected ; and if pardon be, even for a moment, severed from a moral process of renovation, if these two are not made to



stand in organic and vital connexion with one another, that door is opened through which mischief will rush in. And thus pardon may be made to hold an illegitimate place in the Christian system, as when it is said that the condition and means of pardon are simply to believe that we are pardoned. . . .

'12. Pardon . . . has both a legitimate and a most important place in the Christian scheme. What is that place? and what is pardon itself? . . . I suppose we do not travel far from the line of accuracy if we allege that pardon is what in the Pauline sense would be initial justification. . . . There is . . . a limited or partial accommodation to the forensic idea, when use is made in theology of the word pardon, and of a justification which primarily signifies not righteousness but acquittal. Let us attempt to illustrate this accommodating use by contrasting it with the case of physical disease under remedial treatment. Here the physician and the patient alike have to look only to the ailment and the remedy, operating upon one another. There is no such thing as an imputed cure. What the remedy gains the malady loses, and *vice versa*. There is no cure except an actual cure: no assurance of health of any kind until, and just in so far as, actual health is recovered.

'The case is, however, different when we consider man as labouring under moral ailment, and as receiving the care of the Great Physician. Here, when the centre of His being is effectually reached, and the inmost spring of action, which had wrought for evil, now turns to goodness and to God as its source, the taint of former sin, the force of evil bias, is not at once, nor perhaps for a long and weary time, effectually removed. The man remains sinful except in his intention for the future. What is this intention required to be in order to bring it within the saving grace of the Gospel? Not merely a weak, not merely even a strong, remorse. Not a mere velleity of good, however that velleity be free from the taint of conscious insincerity at the moment. No, it must be the sovereign faculty of will truly (but whether permanently or not is a question only collateral to the present inquiry) turned to God, and actually and supremely operative upon the workings of the whole man. . . . If the heart is right with God in that sense which so many pages of the Scripture establish and define for us by living instances, then there is pardon; there is that living seed of actual righteousness which has only to grow, under the laws appointed for our nature, in order to complete the work. Pardon is properly a thing imputed' (pp. 323-6).

Mr. Gladstone then proceeds to distinguish between the 'remedial' and the 'simply penal consequences of sin.' The 'remedial' consequences of sin, which constitute the work of 'corrective justice,' 'the pain and shame of recollection,' 'the struggle with the enemy,' which are 'not opposed to pardon,' or 'restraints' upon it, but 'co-operators' with it, remain in those who are pardoned. But, besides the pardon which is imputed to them, 'relief' from the 'penal consequences of

sin' is imparted to them (pp. 326-7). These 'penal consequences' are defined to be

'the pains, strictly penal as to the offender, morally exemplary for others, which attach themselves to sin when it has been deliberately and obstinately cherished. These are the pains due to, and seemingly inseparable from, that Divine constitution of the universe under which guilt and misery are bound one to another, in its permanent arrangements, by a chain of iron' (p. 327).

From all this it is inferred that

'the Atonement of Christ . . . has its foundations deeply laid in the moral order of the world, and is an all-powerful instrument for the promotion of righteousness' (p. 327) ;

and that

'the doctrine of free pardon is not a passport for sin, nor a derogation from the moral order which carefully adapts reward and retribution to desert, but stands in the closest harmony with the component laws of our moral nature' (p. 328).

In endeavouring to estimate the value of the article from which we have thus freely quoted it will be necessary for us to give some consideration to the doctrine with which it is concerned. And in proceeding to do so we may notice that the Atonement illustrates in a very marked way the fact of the intimate connexion of the different parts of Christian truth and the harm that necessarily results from any attempt to isolate them. Such attacks on the doctrine as that which Mr. Gladstone criticizes have been made possible by the isolation or by the unbalanced prominence in which it has been placed.

It is natural, then, to call attention to some of the fundamental truths which this doctrine presupposes. The first of them is the necessary holiness of God. We sometimes hear God's claim that the lives of men must be holy spoken of as if it were an arbitrary law, dependent upon caprice, alterable at any moment. The truth is that it is the necessary outcome of the being of God. The laws of God are no matter of arbitrary choice ; they are the necessary result of those attributes which cannot be distinguished, except in thought, from the Divine Essence itself.

The sin of the human race and of individual human beings is a great fact penetrating deeply into the moral being of man. Whatever truth there may be in the Augustinian doctrine of the negative character of sin,<sup>1</sup> it is none the less true that

<sup>1</sup> It is, of course, true that sin is always a perversion of what might be good : see, e.g., St. Athan. *C. Gentes*, vi. vii. ; St. Aug. *Enchirid.* xii.

human sinfulness is a tremendous reality ; and, of necessity, it must be a wrong condition of man's own nature and an offence against God.

Thus we have confronting one another two facts. God, being what He is and what He cannot cease to be, necessarily demands holiness. Man is sinful.

There are many subjective reasons which make it easy to understand that pardon easily given by God would have led to a light view of sin among men. These subjective reasons run back into an objective truth—that the very Being of God itself and the actual condition of man make necessary a great act of Atonement.

Another truth which the doctrine of the Atonement presupposes is expressed in the dogma of the Holy Trinity. It is God the Son who by an act of Divine power makes atonement for human sin to God the Father. But the sin for which He atones is an outrage no less against Him than against the Father. His attitude towards sin is no less necessarily an attitude of wrath than is that of the Father. He, too, by virtue of His Being, is necessarily holy. For Him, too, to tolerate unholiness is an impossibility. The Sacrifice of Calvary is as much in harmony with His eternal nature as it is the outcome of the sentence of the Father, the sentence which is involved in the righteousness of God.

And as the eternal holiness of God the Son requires the Death upon the Cross, so also does the love of God the Father willingly accept it. It is the love of the Son which endures the penalty, but the same love is no less a part of the Father's life.

As, then, the need for a great Atonement rests upon objective realities and upon the essential Being of God Himself, so too its method is the outcome of fundamental truth.

The doctrine we are considering presupposes, further, the reality of the union of our Lord with men. In redeeming us God the Son takes our own nature. His Humanity is not something which He imperfectly unites with Himself. The Personality, alike of His eternal Being and of His human nature, is that of God. The Humanity He receives from His holy Mother does not possess a Personality other than that which is Divine. And this implies not only the most intimate and personal union between the two natures of our Lord

xiii. xxiii. xxiv. ; St. John Dam. *Fid. Orthod.* ii. 4, 12 ; St. Thom. Aq. *Summa Theologica*, I. xlviii. 1, 3, xlix. 1-3, II<sup>1</sup>. lxxv. 1. But it may be doubted whether the particular form which this doctrine was given by St. Augustine is satisfactory : see Mozley, *Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, pp. 253-6 ; Bright, *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, pp. 271-5.

Himself, but also the most complete association of ourselves with Him. In condemning Nestorius the Church was vindicating the truth, not less dear to St. Paul<sup>1</sup> than to St. John,<sup>2</sup> that in the acts of the Redeemer the redeemed have a true share.

But the union between the Christian and Christ, whereby the Christian receives the benefits of that Redemption which Christ won, in potentiality, for the whole race which shares His Manhood, is not understood except when it is seen to be sacramental. To be the sons of God in the true Christian sense is a possibility because Baptism makes men members of Christ.

And, once more, the doctrine of the Atonement presupposes the destined perfection of those who are justified by faith. It is the power of faith in the life of a Christian that thereby he places himself in the hands of God. In that surrender God sees, if man does not always see, the true end. There is no arbitrary acceptance by Divine power of an unholy life. There is no imaginative process by which man is supposed to be something which he is not. God is necessarily holy. God is necessarily true. But in the beginning the Divine Foreknowledge sees that which is to come. The initial act of surrender supplies the possibility of a long growth. As the man places himself in the hands of God he enters upon the course of life which, by means of true belief and steadfast obedience and persistent reception of grace, is destined to issue in the possession and perfecting of every virtue and every moral beauty to which his manhood is able to attain.

The due appreciation, then, of the doctrine of the Atonement in its positive aspect is possible only for those who are giving due weight to the whole system of theology of which it forms a part. This is a fact which has been sadly illustrated by the strange and distorted ideas of justification and the work of Christ which have been honestly held and earnestly taught by sincere and well-meaning Christians, who while believing in the Atonement have failed to accept other and closely connected doctrines of the Christian Faith. And we may illustrate it in a different way by noticing some of the objections which have been made, on moral grounds, to the doctrine itself.

There have been thoughtful minds to whom it has formed a real difficulty that God should exact a penalty at all. It has seemed to them hard that He should not without any act

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* Gal. ii. 20, iii. 27, iv. 19.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.* 1 St. John i. 3, iii. 9.

of  
cruc  
of  
arg  
gra  
if  
deli

nar  
nec  
law  
Hin  
onc  
of a  
dign  
and  
earn  
here  
righ  
betw  
trary  
that  
He s

A  
is an  
God  
shou  
God  
the  
burd

I  
mere  
bear  
the p  
sarily  
V  
with  
that  
it fro  
tative  
quest  
sacrif

1 2  
Rom.  
Dei, v  
VO

of redemption forgive; and some of them have thought it cruel that the penalty should be so great. And, as a matter of mere logic of a narrow kind, there is some force in the argument that if God is Almighty it is within His power to grant a forgiveness that is in all respects wholly free, and that if He is All-merciful such a forgiveness is what He would delight to give.

When, however, we pass beyond the bounds of a mere narrow logic and consider that God is a moral Being of necessary holiness, and that sin is a real offence against a law which is the outcome of His essential Nature and against Himself, the worthless character of such an argument is at once evident. In requiring the Atonement there is no action of an arbitrary will demanding the satisfaction of an offended dignity; there is the moral claim of the eternal laws of right and wrong. For on the hypothesis of the Christian Creed, earnestly fought for and persistently maintained against heresies of the most dangerous type, the opposition between right and wrong is of a necessary character, the distinction between them ineffaceable. And if so it would be as contrary to the laws of the being of Him who is eternal holiness that He should grant forgiveness without Atonement as that He should deny Himself.<sup>1</sup>

Again, an objection has been raised that the Atonement is an act of injustice on the part of God the Father towards God the Son. It is unjust, it is said, that the innocent should suffer and the guilty be benefited, that the Son of God should die and man should receive life. In so enacting, the almighty power of the Father lays upon the Son a burden which it cannot have been right to impose.

It is obvious that this objection is not sufficiently met merely by pointing out that the Son of God was willing to bear the penalty of human sin. That willingness might prove the perfection of His own self-sacrifice; it would not necessarily show the justice of the Father.

When, however, the reality of the union of the Divine Son with the human race is also considered, and when it is seen that He who as God requires the penalty, and as Son accepts it from the Father's hands, is also as Man a true representative of those for whom He offers, there is new light on the question. Nothing is lost of the condescension or of the sacrifice, but in proportion as His union with mankind is real,

<sup>1</sup> 2 Ep. to Tim. ii. 13; Ep. to Tit. i. 2; Heb. vi. 18. Cf. St. Clem. Rom. 1 *Ep. ad Cor.* xxvii.; St. Aug. *De Symb. ad Catech.* ii., *De Civit. Dei*, v. x. 1.

in that proportion the sentence upon Him is not unjust ; and, as we have seen, the Church's declaration is that the union is in the fullest sense complete, since He wrapped human nature which did not possess the dividing power of personality round His eternal Being, so that its personality was Divine. If there are those to whom the condemnation of Nestorianism is an empty piece of metaphysical ingenuity, to them the Atonement may be unjust. For the Catholic believer in the one Person of Him who is God and Man the injustice vanishes as He sees what the union of the Incarnation implies.

A deeper objection than either of those we have already noticed is that the Father must be regarded as immoral in allowing man to be benefited because of the sufferings of His Son, since true morality requires that a person should be benefited only because of what he himself does and is. If, it may be said, God is, as you claim, a moral Being whose outraged law demands atonement, man is a moral being too, and he is degraded if he sins and does not suffer because of the sufferings of the innocent.

It is only part of the answer to this objection to point out again the union of the Incarnation, and to explain how the union in the Sacraments shows man's true share in Christ's work. It is only another part to distinguish between the penalty of eternal loss which Christ wholly removed from all who will accept His grace and the penalties of sufferings in time which the redeemed, however penitent, have still to bear. There is a further truth, already spoken of, in the light of which it may be seen that in the forgiveness of man he is treated as the moral being he certainly is. That truth is the destiny of the forgiven. With poor, imperfect movements the soul struggles towards the light ; with weak, faltering touch it lays hold of the work of Christ ; with resolutions made with difficulty and thought of in fear it turns away from the wrong that allures. It is easy for the stern, natural moralist, in his care for the dignity of the human race, to think and speak with contempt of the act of faith which justifies the soul ; but it is easy because he is blind. He sees nothing of all that is to issue from the act. This movement towards righteousness, which is the human response to the Divine gift of quickening grace, is but the beginning of the eternal glory of highest morality which the forgiven are one day to possess.

Forgiveness is the free gift of God. It is not given to any because they are holy ; but it is given to those whose



will aim at deliverance from unholiness, to those who, if they persevere, will become at length perfectly holy.

The advocates of a righteousness which, while it is imputed, is not imparted, the deniers, if such there be in thought as well as in word, of the possibility of a real holiness which is man's own possession, may be without an answer to the objection we have noticed last. The Catholic believer in the possibility of holiness upon earth and the perfection of holiness in heaven may with all confidence deny that man is degraded when he is forgiven.

'I do not find that the Scripture has explained it.' So wrote the calm wisdom of the philosopher Bishop<sup>1</sup> a century and a half ago on the subject of the 'method' of the Atonement. The thoughtful Christian of to-day may well make the words his own. Into the deep mystery of the Atonement the wisest theologians have been permitted to see only a little way. Athanasius and Augustine, Gregory of Nazianzus and Leo, Anselm and Aquinas—these and many others have their portions of the truth to tell. But who that has steadily thought over the treatises *De Incarnatione Verbi* and *Cur Deus Homo* can fail to see that there are depths in the doctrine which even the penetrating insight of Athanasius and the daring subtlety of Anselm do not touch?

Yet, as we have tried to show, there are considerations which may lessen the difficulties which have spread like clouds over some bright minds, and sometimes crippled faith when they have not destroyed it; and to definite objections the Catholic Creed has definite answers, which, for a mind that is prepared to acknowledge that in the present condition of our faculties complete light is not to be expected, may well be sufficient. But it is a condition of the possibility of these considerations and these answers having due weight that the Christian Faith be regarded not as a collection of separable dogmas, but as an organic whole.

We have laid great stress on the union between God the Son and the nature of man in the Incarnation, and on that between Christ and Christians in the Sacraments, as bearing on the real share which the redeemed have in the work of their Redeemer, and we have referred to the truth that the forgiven have still to bear temporal penalties for sin. There is another side of the doctrine of the Atonement which needs to be emphasized. In language sometimes too lightly set aside the Death of Christ is 'vicarious,' it is a 'satisfaction' for human sin; in it is a work of 'substitution,' a suffering 'in

<sup>1</sup> Butler, *Analogy of Religion*, pt. ii. ch. 5.

our stead.' Such language expresses truth because of the simple fact that if Christ had not died we should have suffered eternal loss.

There have been times when the vicarious element in the work of Christ has been taught out of all proportion and in forgetfulness of other truth, and in language, to say the least, of an exaggerated kind. There is now a danger, of which we may be kept in mind by more than one recent book of wide circulation, of a reaction from such teaching which may be full of harm. And we may be allowed to quote a passage of great value from a distinguished living writer in which the use of the words which not a few are inclined to abandon is shown to follow naturally from the consideration of central truth.

'He who was thus given, who thus gave Himself, had been God from all eternity, from, and in, and with the Father. His Godhead could impart a Divine efficacy to all that He did or suffered in His manhood, and a Divine significance to that headship over our race which made Him its sole competent representative. But, in so representing us, He could, in the fullest sense, stand for us. By submitting to a Passion which was spiritual as well as physical, which included the agony of the Sin-bearer and the tremendous experience of the Forsaken, He, the Man who ceased not to be God, upheld, with unique transcendent emphasis, the eternal law of righteousness against sin; "the principle that we, sinners, deserved to suffer, being asserted in His sufferings, that it might not have to be asserted in ours."<sup>1</sup> In this sense He gave Himself a ransom for many, and our sins were in effect laid upon Him: He could take them away on our behalf, because, as the Lamb of God, He had borne their burden, had endured the chastisement of our peace. "Vicarious"—"substitution"—"satisfaction"—we must not give up the use of these terms in a sense that is neither immoral nor arbitrary, but consonant to our Saviour's office as Second Adam, and involved in the very perfection of His own miraculous love."<sup>2</sup>

What we have already said will have shown the attitude we think it necessary to adopt towards Mr. Gladstone's article. We recognize fully his desire to commend the doctrine of the Atonement to those whom much theological literature never reaches and who would not be likely to be influenced by theological treatises of a scientific kind. We welcome, with a sense of gratitude, his clear statement that the sufferings of Christ are 'vicarious,' and his emphatic teaching that the deliverance of the sinner by Christ is a

<sup>1</sup> That is, of course, by our eternal loss. This sentence is from Dale, *The Atonement*, p. 433.

<sup>2</sup> Bright, *Fidelity and Sympathy United in True Teachers* (a sermon preached at the Cuddesdon College Festival in 1891, published by Parker and Co.), pp. 13, 14.

deliverance from sin as well as from pain. None the less, making all allowances for the evident object of the article, we are constrained to question the expediency of the silence it maintains or its want of clear statement on essential parts of the doctrine of which it treats. In particular we have looked in vain for such emphasis as we should have liked to see on the sacrificial character of Christ's Death.

The position occupied in Holy Scripture by sacrifice is very remarkable. Sacrifice was the means whereby Abel was acceptable.<sup>1</sup> It was offered by Noah in thanksgiving, but served the further purpose of eliciting the promise and the blessing of God.<sup>2</sup> By it the covenants which God made with Abram<sup>3</sup> and Jacob<sup>4</sup> were ratified. The building of an altar was associated with patriarchal acts of worship.<sup>5</sup> A ram was offered on the mountain in the land of Moriah because of a special revelation from the angel of the Lord.<sup>6</sup> The blood of the Passover lamb was the token through which the Israelites were not smitten with the Egyptians.<sup>7</sup> Under the Mosaic Law sacrifices were the means of propitiation, of thanksgiving, of worship.<sup>8</sup>

In all the stages of the development of sacrifice the idea of substitution occurred. In the simplest forms it was the special dedication to God of a part where the whole, as being His gift, was really His possession.<sup>9</sup> The ram offered by Abraham was a substituted victim because of which a human life was spared.<sup>10</sup> The regulations about the first-born commanded that human children should be redeemed by another offering.<sup>11</sup> In all the sacrifices that which was offered was given to God in one way as a symbol that he who offered it gave himself in another way.

The gift to God in the sacrifices of the Old Testament was more than a symbol of the moral surrender of the worshipper. It was a type of the offering of Christ.<sup>12</sup> And it would be impossible to conceive of any way whereby it could be more emphatically taught that the Death of Christ was sacrificial than the way in which preparation was made for it. With the elaborate foreshadowing of the Jewish services the words

<sup>1</sup> Gen. iv. 4; cf. Heb. xi. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. viii. 20-22.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xv. 7-18.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. xxxv. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Gen. xii. 8, xxvi. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. xxii. 11-13.

<sup>7</sup> Ex. xii. 13.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Lev. i.-vii.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. Gen. iv. 4; cf. Lev. xxiii. 10; Num. xviii. 17-19.

<sup>10</sup> Gen. xxii. 13, וַיִּקַּח אֶת-הָאֵילָן וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ לְעֹלָה תַחַת בְּנוֹ

<sup>11</sup> Ex. xiii. 2, 12, 13, 15, xxxiv. 20; Num. xviii. 15, 16.

<sup>12</sup> Heb. ix. x.

of the prophets are in harmony. If the language of Isaiah<sup>1</sup> is clearer than that of most of the prophets, the same truth is nevertheless involved in what others say.<sup>2</sup> St. John the Baptist, the immediate forerunner of our Lord, has the same message to deliver. To those brought up in the Jewish religion the words, 'Behold the Lamb of God'<sup>3</sup> could only mean that He of whom they were spoken was a sacrificial victim. Our Lord Himself by word and by act showed that His work was a sacrifice on behalf of and in the stead of others.<sup>4</sup> St. Paul,<sup>5</sup> St. Peter,<sup>6</sup> the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews,<sup>7</sup> St. John,<sup>8</sup> all emphasize the sacrificial efficacy of His Death. To St. John, indeed, even in the vision of the unseen, the sacrifice of Christ fills no unimportant place.<sup>9</sup>

It is, then, a Scriptural view of the Death of Christ to regard it as being sacrificial, and a large number of separate passages and the whole general tone of the New Testament concur in teaching that this sacrifice is truly representative of

<sup>1</sup> See especially Isa. liii. 4-6, 10-12. With the use of קָרַב in verses 4 and 12 cf., e.g., Lev. x. 17, xvii. 16, xxiv. 15; and with אָשָׁם in verse 10 cf., e.g., Lev. v. 6; 1 Sam. vi. 3.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Job xxxiii. 24, especially קָרַבְתִּי לַפֶּה; Ps. xxii.; Zech. xiii. 7-9.

<sup>3</sup> St. John i. 29, 36.

<sup>4</sup> See Dale, *The Atonement*, pp. 67-92. Dr. Dale establishes the following points from our Lord's own 'testimony concerning His Death':—(1) His Death was neither the incidental nor the inevitable consequence of His collision with the passions and prejudices of the Jewish people. (2) The laying down of His life was a voluntary act. (3) To lay down His life was one of the ends for which He came into the world. (4) His Death is immediately related to the deliverance from condemnation of those who believe in Him, to the remission of sins, and to the establishment of His sovereignty over the human race. (5) He accepted the testimony of St. John the Baptist that He was the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and He associated His Death with the sacrifice of the Passover lamb on the night of the Exodus. (6) He described His Death as a death for others, and more specifically He said that He gave His life a ransom for others. In any adequate theory of the purpose of the Death of Christ these various statements must find a place and an explanation. It is further necessary, in any theory of His Death, to account for the extent to which it filled His mind from the commencement of His Ministry, the increasing fear with which He anticipated it as it came nearer, and the mysterious sorrow He endured on the Cross, a sorrow which compelled Him to cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" (pp. 91-92). Compare the same writer's *Christian Doctrine*, pp. 111, 112.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Acts xx. 28; Rom. iii. 24, 25 (especially *ὁν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*); 1 Cor. xv. 3; Gal. iii. 13; Eph. i. 7, ii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10.

<sup>6</sup> 1 St. Pet. i. 19, ii. 21-24, iii. 18.

<sup>7</sup> Heb. vii. 27, ix. 11-18, x. 1-20, 29, xii. 24, xiii. 11, 12.

<sup>8</sup> 1 St. John i. 7, iii. 16, iv. 10.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. v. 6-14.

saiah<sup>1</sup>  
truth is  
n the  
e same  
h reli-  
l only  
ificial  
d that  
ead of  
stle to  
fficacy  
sion of  
place.<sup>9</sup>  
t to re-  
parate  
ament  
tive of

n verses  
n verse

xiii. 7-9.

shes the  
ing His  
evitable  
s of the  
ary act.  
me into  
ce from  
of sins,  
(5) He  
lamb of  
is Death  
Exodus.  
pecifically  
adequate  
atements  
in any  
lled His  
ear with  
s sorrow  
y, "My  
pare the

ο Θεός  
iii. 13;

man because of the reality of the human nature of Christ, and has its peculiar efficacy because of His Godhead.<sup>1</sup> Moreover this is, in the Bible, the most prominent aspect of His Death.

The history of the doctrine of the Atonement in the Church shows in the most remarkable way how essential a part of the Christian Faith is the belief in the sacrificial character of Christ's work. As is well known, there have been very different theories on some matters connected with the Atonement held by Christian teachers of authority. But through them all, consistently or inconsistently, the solid fact remains that Christ's Death was a sacrifice for human sin. In the Epistle of Clement of Rome the 'blood of Christ' is spoken of as 'precious unto the Father,' as 'shed for our salvation,' as having 'won for the whole world the grace of repentance';<sup>2</sup> it was typified by the scarlet thread in the house of Rahab as the means of redemption; it was 'given for' Christians 'by the will of God.'<sup>3</sup> In the writings of Ignatius Christ 'suffered for our sakes,' 'judgment awaiteth' those who 'believe not in His blood,' His 'flesh suffered for our sins.'<sup>4</sup> To the mind of Polycarp 'our Lord Jesus Christ endured to face even death for our sins,' and 'died for our sakes.'<sup>5</sup> In the Epistle of Barnabas it is said that the 'Son of God suffered in order that the stroke inflicted on Him might give life to us,' that He 'could not suffer except for our sakes,' and that in fulfilment of the type of the sacrifice of Isaac He was destined 'to offer the vessel of His Spirit as a sacrifice for our sins.'<sup>6</sup> It is the teaching of the letter to Diognetus that He was given by the Father as 'a ransom for us,' because nothing but 'His righteousness' was 'capable of covering our sins,' and because we could not be 'justified' by any other than the 'Son of God.'<sup>7</sup> Justin

<sup>1</sup> See especially Heb. i.-x.

<sup>2</sup> St. Clem. Ro. i *Ep. ad Cor.* vii.: ἀνείσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθέν πατρὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπένεγκεν. Bishop Lightfoot (*in loco*) writes on ὑπένεγκεν, "offered." So it is generally taken, but this sense is unsupported; for Xen. *Hell.* iv. 7, 2, Soph. *El.* 834, are not parallels. Perhaps 'won (rescued) for the whole world.'

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* xii., xxi., xlix.

<sup>4</sup> St. Ignat. *Ad Smyr.* ii., vi.

<sup>5</sup> St. Polyc. *Ad Phil.* i., ix.

<sup>6</sup> *Epist. Barn.* vii.: εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, ἔπαθεν ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωοποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς, πιστεύσωμεν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύνατο παθεῖν εἰ μὴ δι' ἡμᾶς. . . αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀμαρτιῶν ἐμελλεν τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος προσφέρειν θυσίαν, ἵνα καὶ ὁ τύπος ὁ γενομένος ἐπὶ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ προσερχθέντος ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τελεσθῇ.

<sup>7</sup> *Epist. ad Diognet.* ix.

Martyr speaks of the blood of Christ as the means of the deliverance of Christians, and compares it with the type of the Passover lamb and the scarlet thread in the house of Rahab.<sup>1</sup> According to Irenæus Christ died and shed His blood for us, and redeemed us by His blood, and by His Passion reconciled us to God.<sup>2</sup> Clement of Alexandria declares that the 'fleshly blood' of Christ 'redeemed' us from 'corruption,'<sup>3</sup> that the 'blood' of 'the Word' was the means of 'salvation' for the 'spirit' of man,<sup>4</sup> and that Christ gave Himself as our 'ransom.'<sup>5</sup> In the teaching of Tertullian Christ was represented by the types of Isaac and the brazen serpent and the scape-goat. He 'redeemed' man 'by His blood,' He restored by the Cross that which Adam had lost by the tree.<sup>6</sup> According to Cyprian Christ overcame death by the trophy of the cross, redeemed the believer by the price of His blood, reconciled man to God the Father.<sup>7</sup> Origen believed that the 'soul of the Son of God was given as a ransom for us,'<sup>8</sup> and that His death was for the healing of our wounds.<sup>9</sup> In the theology of Gregory of Nazianzus,<sup>10</sup> Gregory of Nyssa,<sup>11</sup> Basil,<sup>12</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>13</sup> Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>14</sup> Ambrose,<sup>15</sup> Leo,<sup>16</sup> Athana-

<sup>1</sup> Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* xcvi., cxi.

<sup>2</sup> Irenæus, *C. Hær.* iii. xvi. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* ii. 2 : διττὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν αἰ τοῦ σαρκικόν, ὃ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* *Pæd.* i. 5 : φέρει γὰρ οἶνον ἢ ἀμπελος, ὡς αἷμα ὁ λόγος· ἀμφὺ δὲ ἀνθρώποις ποτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν· ὁ μὲν οἶνος, τῷ σώματι· τὸ δὲ αἷμα, τῷ πνεύματι. Cf. ii. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* 'Quis dives salvetur,' xxxvii.

<sup>6</sup> Tertul. *Adv. Judæos*, x., xiii., xiv. ; *De Fuga in Persecut.* xii.

<sup>7</sup> St. Cyp. *Ad Demet.* xxvi.

<sup>8</sup> Orig. *In Mat.* xvi. 8 : οὐκοῦν ἡγοράσθημεν μὲν τῷ τιμίῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ αἵματι, δέδοται δὲ λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οὔτε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, πρότερον γὰρ αὐτὸ προέθετο τῷ πατρὶ λέγων· πατέρ εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου· οὔτε τὸ σῶμα, οὐδὲν γὰρ εὐρομένῳ πῶ τοιοῦτον περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένον.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* *In Joan.* xxviii. 14.

<sup>10</sup> St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xlv. 22.

<sup>11</sup> St. Greg. Nys. *Catech. Orat.* xxiii.

<sup>12</sup> St. Basil, *Hom. in Ps. XLVIII.* 3, 4.

<sup>13</sup> St. Cyr. Jer. *Cat.* xiii. 33.

<sup>14</sup> St. Cyr. Alex. *Adv. Nest.* iii. 2 ; *De Recta Fide* (p. 7, Aubert).

<sup>15</sup> St. Ambrose, *De Fuga Sac.* vii. : 'Ideo ergo suscepit Jesus carnem, ut maledictum carnis peccatricis aboleret; et factus est pro nobis maledictum ut benedictio absorberet maledictionem, integritas peccatum, indulgentia sententiam, vita mortem. Suscepit enim et mortem, ut impleretur sententia, satisfaceret iudicatio: Maledictum carnis peccatricis usque ad mortem. Nihil ergo factum est contra sententiam Dei, cum sit divinæ conditio impleta sententiæ. Maledictum enim usque ad mortem, post mortem autem gratia.'

<sup>16</sup> St. Leo, *Serm.* lxiv. (*De Pass. Dom.* xiii.), 3 ; lxviii. (*De Pass. Dom.* xvii.), 3.



sus,<sup>1</sup> the death of Christ is an act of redemption. Augustine, alike in the exhortation of a sermon<sup>2</sup> or the quiet thought of a theological treatise,<sup>3</sup> or the passionate outpouring of his soul's devotion,<sup>4</sup> could regard Christ as the Victim because of whom the Father is well pleased with man. Were it needful to go further, such names as Gregory the Great,<sup>5</sup> John of Damascus,<sup>6</sup> Bernard,<sup>7</sup> Anselm,<sup>8</sup> might speak for the Church of later times.

In the teaching of the Church, then, as in Holy Scripture, the Atonement is possible because of the sacrificial efficacy of the death of Christ, and the death of Christ is capable of its great work because in His one Person are united the two natures of God and Man.<sup>9</sup>

Let us notice the significance of the long list of writers to whom we have referred. It includes theologians of very different dates and from the most widely separated parts of the Church, men of the most varied natural temperaments and spiritual gifts, writers as divergent in methods of thought and points of view as Leo and Origen, Augustine and the Eastern Gregories, Irenæus and Athanasius. Moreover, on details about the Atonement they do not agree. Gregory of Nazianzus recoils in horror from an idea<sup>10</sup> in which his namesake of Nyssa exults.<sup>11</sup> Anselm is bound to repudiate a theory<sup>12</sup> in which Leo could acquiesce.<sup>13</sup> Great Fathers could at times use language inconsistent with what they themselves had elsewhere said.<sup>14</sup> But, whatever their nationality or time or modes of thought, or whatever minor differences there

<sup>1</sup> St. Athan. *De Incarn.* xx.

<sup>2</sup> St. Aug. *Serm.* ccxv. 4, 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Id. De Trinit.* xiii. 11 (§ 15).

<sup>4</sup> *Id. Conf.* x. 43 (§ 69).

<sup>5</sup> St. Greg. *Magn. Mor.* xvii. 30 (§ 46).

<sup>6</sup> St. John Dam. *De Fide Orthod.* iii. 27.

<sup>7</sup> St. Bern. *De Error. Abel.* viii., especially 'Non requisivit Deus Pater sanguinem Filii, sed tamen acceptavit oblatum; non sanguinem sitiens, sed salutem, quia salus erat in sanguine. Salus plane, et non, sicut iste sapit et scribit, sola charitatis ostensio.'

<sup>8</sup> St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, passim.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., St. Athan. *De Incarn.* vi.-ix.; *C. Arian.* iii. 29-32; St. Cyr. *Jer. Cat.* xiii. 2, 33; St. Cyr. Alex. *De Trin.* iv. (t. Va. pp. 508, 509, Aubert); St. Hil. Pict. *De Trin.* ii. 24; St. Aug. *De Trin.* xiii. 11 (§ 15); St. Leo, *Serm.* xxi. (*In Nat. Dom.* i.), 2; xxviii. (*In Nat. Dom.* viii.), 3.

<sup>10</sup> St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xlv. 22.

<sup>11</sup> St. Greg. Nys. *Cat. Orat.* xxii.-xxvi.

<sup>12</sup> St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 19.

<sup>13</sup> St. Leo, *Serm.* xxii. (*In Nat. Dom.* ii.), 3, 4; lxi. (*De Pass. Dom.* x.), 4.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Irenæus, *C. Hær.* v. i. 1, compared with III. viii. 2 and v. xxi. 3; St. Leo, *Serm.* xxii. (*In Nat. Dom.* ii.), 3, 4; lxi. (*De Pass. Dom.* x.), 4, compared with lix. (*De Pass. Dom.* viii.), 5, lxiv. (*De Pass. Dom.* xiii.), 3, lxxviii. (*De Pass. Dom.*), 3.

might be among them, they agree that sin had made an objective barrier between man and God, and that by the sacrifice of the Death of Christ it has been removed. So remarkable an agreement declares the judgment of the Divine Spirit working in the Church.

If we understand Mr. Gladstone's article rightly, he would not deny what we have been saying. But he would contend that the truth on which we have been careful to insist is one that is best left out of sight in dealing with particular forms of error and types of mind. It is a dangerous argument to urge that a point of view so prominent in Holy Scripture and in the writings of the Fathers should, under certain circumstances, be as far as possible neglected. And a consideration of great weight is supplied by the fact that, if the standpoint of our present article is correct, the reasonable character, to use often misused words in their true sense, of the doctrine of the Atonement depends upon its being taught in its completeness and in its due relation to other truths. If this is so the case for the truth is always weakened instead of being strengthened by any partial presentation supposed to be fitting to meet the needs of particular minds.

The principle thus involved is of very wide application. There are many who think that by stating part of the truth they may win those who would be alienated by the whole. There may from time to time be individual cases which seem to justify such a course of action. But we are convinced that the real strength of Christian truth, and of each doctrine that forms part of it, lies in its completeness. What is needed in practical teaching is rather the absence of exaggeration in the statement of individual doctrines, and the preservation of balance and proportion in the relation of them to one another, than any temporary or partial modification of the doctrines themselves.

If so it is a grave practical mistake, in treating one side of the great question of the Atonement, to leave out of sight so essential a part of the full truth as the sacrificial nature of the work of Christ, and to call attention so slightly to the single Personality of the Redeemer. As it is the unity of the Person of Christ which suggests the true answer to the fear that the Atonement was an act of injustice to our Lord, so it is the Sacrifice which He, as true God and perfect Man, offered on the Cross which gives to the whole doctrine its profound rationality.

We must not leave unnoticed Mr. Gladstone's statement that 'by the Incarnation Christ took upon Him a nature not

strictly perfect, but perfectible, for He "grew in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man" (p. 322).

It may be said of the nature of any rational creature that it is 'perfectible.' Of the human nature of Christ, on the other hand, it should surely be said that it was, at each stage of life, perfect. He was the perfect Child when He was a year old as truly as He was the perfect Man when His sufferings were accomplished and He yielded His Spirit to the Father. The word 'perfectible' lets in ideas of imperfection which, if we are not mistaken, Mr. Gladstone would repudiate as earnestly as ourselves.

Nor may we quite pass by the concluding paragraph in which, after it has been truly said that 'the promise of perpetuity and immortality to the Church, against which the gates of hell are not to prevail, is a promise to the Church at large, and not to its individual members, or even to its particular sections' (p. 330), Mr. Gladstone goes on to suggest that it may be possible for 'the Christian Church at large' to go 'astray in matters not vital to the Christian faith,' in the same way that the 'promise of an indestructible holiness and striving after the image of God does not exclude vast masses of sin from her precincts' (p. 331). It would be impossible at the end of an article on another subject to deal adequately with a matter of so great importance, and involving questions so difficult as the relation of the Church's sanctity and the Church's truth, the meaning of 'going astray,' and the nature of 'matters not vital to the Christian faith,' and Mr. Gladstone does not attempt to discuss the problem he has thus raised. We must be content to follow his example, and for the present, at any rate, must say no more than record our conviction that some parts of the paragraph to which we have referred are open to criticism from the point of view of the Catholic doctrine of the teaching office of the Church.

We have the greatest admiration for the way in which, throughout a singularly active and busy life, Mr. Gladstone has found time to maintain the study of theology, and for the powers he exhibits of dealing with it; but we should be false to truth we think it a high duty to preserve if we did not express our opinion that the limitations of the article on 'True and False Conceptions of the Atonement' have been dictated by an error of judgment, and our regret that the brilliant writer of it did not use his magnificent abilities in a more complete statement of the true doctrine of the atoning power of the Death of Christ.

## ART. VI.—THE LIFE OF CHRIST IN ART.

1. *The Life of Christ as represented in Art.* By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster; Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen and to the House of Commons. Author of *The Life of Christ*, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, &c. (London, 1894.)
2. *Raphael's Madonnas and other great Pictures, reproduced from the Original Paintings; with a Life of Raphael, and an Account of his Chief Works.* By KARL KARÖLY. (London and New York, 1894.)

THE Archdeacon of Westminster is a well-known writer and controversialist. He is the author of a popular *Life of Christ*, and of a vast number of other books on the most varied subjects. Sermons and biographies, polemical pamphlets and theological treatises, magazine articles and child's stories, flow from his prolific pen, year after year, in the same amazing quantity. No topic comes amiss to his versatile imagination and facile pen. He carries on a fiery theological controversy in the pages of one periodical, and at the same moment writes a Christmas number for another. One day he publishes a volume of sermons on the Lord's Prayer, and the next he writes a preface to the *Imitatio*, and once more attacks his favourite bugbears of Romanism and sacerdotalism. None the less we own to a sense of surprise in finding him among the art critics. Yet, strange to say, this is actually the case. A *Life of Christ as represented in Art*, numbering 500 pages, and copiously adorned with illustrations, is Dr. Farrar's latest achievement in the field of popular literature.

After his usual habit, the Archdeacon has availed himself largely of other men's labours, and careful examination will show how small is the amount of original matter contained in the handsome volume before us. The bulk of the work consists in quotations from the writings of well-known historians and critics of art. As many as seventeen or eighteen pages are borrowed from the works of Mr. Ruskin, besides which, at every turn, we find lengthy paragraphs from Vasari and Waagen, Eastlake and Kugler, Burckhardt and Lübke, Woltmann and Woermann, Crowe and Cavalcaselle, as well as from the series of *Lives of Artists* edited by Dr. Robert Dohme, and a host of other standard works. Lord Lindsay, Mrs. Heaton, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Dennistoun, Mr. John Addington Symonds, Mr. Watkiss Lloyd, Dr. Lübke, the Academy speeches

of Sir Frederic Leighton, and, above all, Mr. Edward Cook's popular *Handbook to the National Gallery*, are among the other authorities who are the most frequently quoted in these pages. There is, indeed, no end to the long list of writers, in English, French, German, and Italian, whose books and magazine articles have supplied Dr. Farrar with descriptions and criticism of pictures for his pages. Unfortunately, he has not devoted enough of his own time and thought to the study of this new branch of history, and not all the vast array of references drawn up in the table at the end of his book have saved him from blunders and inaccuracies of the most dismal type. For instance, at p. 428, he describes Giovanni Bellini's 'Pietà,' in the Berlin Gallery, and informs us that this picture, one of the most famous masterpieces of the great Venetian's art, is the work of Andrea Mantegna. Again, at p. 202, he tells us that Mantegna's 'Madonna della Vittoria,' now in the Louvre, was 'painted for the Marquis Francesco Gonzago [sic], of Mantua, after his victory over Charles XIII. at Furnova, in 1485.' Mantegna's splendid altar-piece, as every student of Italian history and Renaissance art is aware, was painted for Francesco Gonzaga, after his victory over Charles VIII. at Fornovo on July 6, 1495. Elsewhere we are told that Raphael painted his 'Transfiguration' and died in 1510, instead of 1520, and that Fra Angelico's 'Madonna of the Star' is 'in the convent of St. Mark's, at Venice'—a mistake which is repeated twice over. On p. 442 he first describes Perugino's well-known 'Resurrection' in the Vatican, and then informs us that 'the same subject has also been treated by Raphael in the Vatican.' In point of fact, there is in this Gallery only one picture of the subject, which was formerly supposed to be Raphael's work, but is now recognized as that of Perugino. Then, again, Dr. Farrar informs us that Lorenzo Lotto was born at Bergamo, whereas, if he will turn to the list of painters which he has borrowed from Sir Frederic Burton, at the end of his own book, he will see that the painter is there described as a native of Treviso.

Dr. Farrar quotes largely both from Morelli's *Italian Painters* and from a still more recent work, Mr. Berenson's *Essay on Venetian Painters*. But he has not apparently studied these admirable critics to much purpose, since he persists in ascribing to Raphael such inferior works as the 'Madonna del Divino Amore' at Naples, and the 'Madonna del Passeggio,' which last picture we may as well remind him is not at Vienna, but at Bridgewater House. He might also, if he chose, have learned from Dr. Anton Springer, whom he

quotes repeatedly, that there is no trace of Raphael's hand in Lord Windsor's predella of 'Christ bearing the Cross,' while the best critics now recognize the 'Spasimo di Sicilia' and the 'Madonna della Perla' to be the work of Giulio Romano. But it is still more puzzling to read, at p. 329, that Raphael, Fra Bartolommeo, and Titian all painted pictures of the 'Raising of Lazarus.' We cannot conceive in what gallery of Europe these works are to be found, and have a shrewd suspicion that they exist only in Dr. Farrar's imagination. In her chapter on the 'Miracles of Our Lord,' Mrs. Jameson particularly remarks that there is no example of the 'Raising of Lazarus' among the works of Raphael, or Fra Bartolommeo, or Titian. He might also have learnt from Mrs. Jameson that Dürer's print of 'Christ taking Leave of His Mother' is by no means the only representation of this incident in art. Veronese and Caroto both painted the scene, and it is, as the Archdeacon might have known, the subject of one of Correggio's finest works in London, the picture belonging to Mr. R. H. Benson, which was exhibited at the rooms of the Burlington Fine Arts Club during the whole of last summer.

Such a tissue of blunders and mis-statements can only be the result of lamentable ignorance or inexcusable carelessness on the part of the writer. They are the more to be deplored, since the book will probably, from the nature of its contents, fall into the hands of persons who know but little of art history. The intelligent boys and youths of the working-class, in whose interests, Dr. Farrar tells us in his preface (p. vi) this handbook is written, will be sorely puzzled if, on some trip to Berlin, they find that no 'Pietà' by Mantegna is to be seen in the gallery, and will turn over the pages in the catalogue in vain to find any mention of the picture. And they will certainly discover no fresco of 'The Last Judgment,' by the hand of Giotto, on the walls of Santa Maria Novella of Florence. In a word, Dr. Farrar's knowledge of art is of the most shallow and superficial kind, and the book which he has produced is thoroughly untrustworthy. This is much to be regretted, since Mrs. Jameson's excellent and scholarly *History of Our Lord in Art* is now out of date, and a good book on the subject, by some competent person would have been of great value. But Dr. Farrar, it is plain, is not the man for the task. He might, one would have thought, have been able to learn something of the historical evolution of Italian art from Morelli. But there is absolutely no method, no attempt at chronological arrangement in his treatment of the separate schools. He jumps from one period and country to another, in the most puzzling way, and jumbles Correggio and



Overbeck, Edwin Long and Bonifazio, and Dürer, Francia, and Vandyck, and the Carracci, all up together in the most wonderful confusion. Rembrandt, we notice, is an artist whom he utterly fails to appreciate, and he repeatedly informs us (pp. 247, 335, &c.) that the great Dutchman's masterpieces are mere studies of light and shade.

Another defect which seriously impairs Archdeacon Farrar in his new capacity is his inability to approach any subject excepting from a controversial point of view. The whole book is written, as might indeed be expected from Dr. Farrar's recent utterances, with a strong Protestant bias. He drags modern controversy into his descriptions at every turn, speaks of idolatry, forsooth, as a very real danger at the present time, gives extracts from the devotional books which he dislikes, and condemns the tone of the addresses delivered by Anglican preachers at the so-called 'Three Hours' Services' (p. 374). The introduction of the crucifix is to him a sign of deep corruption in the Church, and he quotes Dr. Dale in support of his contention, 'that the late unscriptural, unprimitive, irreverent introduction of the crucifix into the ordinary emblems of Christianity involved a failure in all true apprehension of the aspect in which we should habitually regard our Risen, Glorified and Ascended Lord' (p. 392). Under this head he proceeds to declaim in turn against 'the crude materialism of cardiolatry' (p. 405), by which he means the *Devotion of the Sacred Heart*, 'the delusions of stigmatics and convulsionaires, the hideous Calvaries and roadside crosses of cretinous Swiss-Italian valleys.' Has Dr. Farrar, we are inclined to ask, ever visited the Sacro Monte of Varallo, or is that famous sanctuary one of the ghastly 'Calvaries,' which he includes in this sweeping denunciation? On this point we should like to refer him to Dr. Arnold, who looked with such deep interest and sympathy at the wayside shrines raised by the piety of the natives in Tyrolese and Alpine valleys.

This unhappy turn of mind is a serious drawback in a writer on Italian art, and renders him inaccessible to the pathos and beauty of its noblest creations. Bellini's wonderful 'Pietà' at Milan, which has been justly called one of the most profoundly moving works of art ever painted, is described by Dr. Farrar as one of the master's least successful pictures, and Mantegna's 'Cristo in Scurto'<sup>1</sup> is a 'vulgar

<sup>1</sup> This spelling is retained in a Florentine edition (1849) of Vasari (v. 195), and in Crowe and Cavalcaselle (*History of Painting in North Italy*, i. 415). In modern Italian it would of course be 'in scorto,' i.e. 'en raccourci,' with reference to the violent foreshortening of the Sacred Figure.

and ghastly corpse,' inconceivably revolting in his eyes. 'But no "Pietà" ever painted,' Dr. Farrar adds, 'gave me much pleasure' (p. 425). The Ascension is another subject which ought in his opinion to have been left unpainted. He is blind to the glory of Giotto's magnificent conception of the Ascending Christ borne on the clouds of heaven back to the Father's arms, and complains of the angels that hover in the air in Perugino's great picture at Lyons as unscriptural, although, as he might have noticed, they bear in their hands scrolls inscribed with the text, 'Why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.' Even Titian's 'Noli me Tangere' distresses him, because Christ is represented as a gardener, 'and a hoe is (very superfluously) placed in His hand' (p. 444): a misconception which he regrets to find in similar pictures by Giotto and Fra Angelico. Dr. Farrar proceeds to show that painters, 'ill-taught by an erring Church' (p. 447), have wholly failed to observe the real meaning of the words 'Touch me not'; and to declare that 'their pictures of the first appearance of the Risen Christ to the penitent sinner have for the most part but little meaning' (p. 447). To many of us Giotto's fresco of the Magdalen kneeling with outstretched arms at the feet of her Risen Lord has seemed full of holy and beautiful teaching, and the white-robed angel with the calm face and uplifted finger, seated by the empty tomb, in Fra Angelico's picture, has given new power to the old message, 'Why seek ye the living among the dead?' And yet Dr. Farrar complains that the mediæval painters are 'untrue to the Gospels,' and insists on the unscriptural details of their pictures! He argues, for instance, that the Apostles ought not to be represented watching their Lord's Ascension, because, in his opinion, there is nothing in St. Luke's account to warrant this fact, and is never tired of protesting against the Five Wounds which are invariably seen in representations of the crucified Christ, because the feet of Our Lord *may* have been tied, not nailed, to the Cross. Such criticism is singularly out of keeping with the whole spirit of early Italian art.

But if this querulous tone is annoying to the reader who loves the touching and childlike simplicity of the old masters, what are we to say to such passages as the following, where the writer has abandoned himself to the full flood of his Protestant indignation, and poured out the whole vials of his wrath on the Church of St. Francis and Fra Angelico?—

'In the tenth century, in ages of deepening superstition and

ignorance, there set in the full flood of realistic art. Then first did Christians venture to represent Christ dead and splashed with blood, and "the last glimpse of divine Majesty suffered total eclipse from the exclusive display of agonized Humanity." But not till the eleventh century was there a bas-relief, and not perhaps till the fourteenth century was there a *portable* crucifix. And by this time there had begun a deep corruption and a disastrous displacement of the true centre of gravity of our faith. Pictures of the Crucifixion could in some crude way set forth the external fact, they could not infuse into it that inexhaustible depth of the divine meaning which might be dimly shadowed by a symbol. . . . Thoughts which are foreign to the Gospel were not only perpetuated, but exclusively obtruded; and in the physical image of the dead Christ, which is entirely foreign to Scripture, men more and more lost sight of His true ideal, of the significance of His Example, of the real meaning of His Gospel. . . . Art may have its degradation in the direction of an all but blasphemous irreverence; hardly less is its influence in the direction of a horrifying superstition. The world and the Church got farther and farther from the conception of the purely ideal image of the Saviour as a beautiful youth, calm and gentle, typical of the rejuvenescence of mankind in Him. This emblem gave way to the grim image of the Saviour as a dismal, macerated monk. . . . And when the joy and peace and hope of religion were thus drowned in seas of agony, when sin, and not God, was made the central thought of religion, floods of crime and degradation followed. What inquisitions and slaughter! What racks and thumb screws and gibbets and implements of horrible cruelty were plied in the desecrated name of truth! What narrowness of belief, and callousness of feeling, and mercilessness of precept, and severity of judgment, and dark dishonouring thoughts of God. Men and nations bowed their necks under the hideous tyranny and ruthless usurpation of inquisitors and priests. The pages of the history of a corrupt and persecuting Church were glued together with the blood of martyrdom' (p. 403):

From such diatribes as these, which are, to say the least of it, wholly out of place in a work of this kind, we turn with relief to the earlier pages in which Dr. Farrar describes the primitive art of the first Christians. Here, at least, he is in full sympathy with his subject, and writes with considerable knowledge of the art of the Catacombs, in those early days before what he calls 'an exaggerated, self-macerating, Manichean asceticism' had changed the smile on the 'boyish face of the Christ of the Catacombs . . . into an expression of misery and wrath' (p. 62). Dr. Farrar lays especial stress on the reserve of the first Christians in painting the human Christ, and notes seven separate stages which mark the gradual development of feeling in this respect. In the earliest ages Christ was only shadowed forth by symbols, such as the dove, the fish, the

VOL. XXXIX.—NO. LXXVIII.

D D

anchor, the ship, the lyre, and the vine. As an emblem referring directly to baptism and also as representing the sacred Name, the fish was the most frequent and favourite symbol during the first four centuries. The Cross does not appear on tombs until the end of the second century or beginning of the third—and then it is only in the form of the *Crux Commissa*, in the shape of the letter T. The sacred monogram  $\chi\rho$  was placed by Constantine on the Labarum in 312; but the Latin Cross is not *certainly* known to occur until it is found on the tomb of Galla Placidia at Ravenna in 451.

In the next stage, Christ was represented indirectly by symbols borrowed from pagan antiquity. Foremost among these we find Orpheus taming the wild beasts with the music of his lyre.

'Few facts are more striking in the history of early Christianity than that its records are so largely borrowed from the dark, subterranean places, where martyrs were buried and the persecuted took refuge, yet that all their emblems were emblems of gladness—the green leaf, the palm-branch, the vine with its purple cluster, the peacocks, the dolphin, the phoenix, the winged genii, the lamb, the dove, the flower. "There is no sign of mourning, no token of resentment, no expression of vengeance," says Dean Milman; "all breathes softness, benevolence, charity." So serene is the resignation of the Christian survivors that even *dolens* (grieving)—the mildest expression of sorrow—is found but rarely; and *infelix* (luckless) occurs but once. No pagan symbol, therefore, better accorded with their tone of mind than that which represented the youthful Orpheus bending the listening trees and charming the savage lions by his celestial harmonies. It indicated Christ as the King of Love and Peace, as the Law of Life, and the Harmony of the World' (p. 34).

Christian art went a step further when it presented Christ and His work under Old Testament types—'Moses striking the Rock,' 'Jonah delivered from the Whale's Mouth,' 'Daniel in the Lions' Den,' 'Abraham sacrificing Isaac,' and 'The Three Children in the Furnace.' From this it passed naturally to the use of New Testament types, and the parables in which Our Lord had Himself spoken to His disciples. 'The Fair Shepherd of the Catacombs' is familiar to us all; most lovely and most fitting of all the symbols under which the first Christians, in those days of stress and trial, loved to think of their Lord and Master. Dr. Farrar dwells with especial force on this type of Our Lord in early Christian art, and points out the great variety of forms in which it is repeated in the mural paintings and sarcophagi of the Cata-

combs. But he ought not to have forgotten the latest and most beautiful representation of the subject, the fifth-century mosaic of the 'Good Shepherd,' in the sepulchral chapel of Galla Placidia, at Ravenna. Here we see our Lord, no longer clad in the short tunic and gaiters of the shepherd bearing the lost sheep on his shoulders, but robed in royal purple, with the nimbus about His brow and the cross of victory in His hand. Around Him His sheep are feeding in the meadows of Paradise. Some are resting, others standing on the shore of a crystal stream; but all alike turn their heads towards the Shepherd and listen for His voice. 'My sheep hear my voice and they follow Me.' The brightest hues of emerald and sapphire, in grass and sky, lend their charm to this pastoral scene; and in all Christian art there is no fairer idyll than this of the Good Shepherd leading His flock to rest in the green pastures and by the still waters.

Another step towards depicting Christ was taken, when actual scenes from the Gospel were represented, although in a purely conventional manner. Sometimes our Lord is seen attended by two of His disciples, healing the lame or raising Lazarus from the dead. The sixth stage was reached when artists began to represent our Lord directly, whether under the youthful type common during the first four centuries, or as the full-grown and bearded, but still noble and dignified Christ, that remained in use until the tenth century; or again as the worn and wearied Sufferer of Byzantine art. The seventh and last of Dr. Farrar's different stages—that is to say, the purely realistic representation of Christ—did not attain its full development until the days of the late Renaissance. It is first seen in the sixteenth century, after which it gradually increases in degradation down to modern days.

'By the eighth century,' writes Dr. Farrar—'but not heartily or unanimously till then—the Church had learned to accept the view argued by St. John of Damascus: "Since He, who being in the form of God . . . yet took upon Him the form of a servant, and put on the fashion of a body . . . therefore represent Him in pictures, and set Him forth to be gazed on openly, who *willed* to be gazed upon. Paint His humiliation, His nativity, His baptism, His transfiguration, His agonies which ransomed us, the miracles which, though wrought by His fleshly ministry, proved His divine power and nature, His sepulture, His resurrection, His ascension—paint all these things in colours as well as in speech, in pictures as well as in books"' (p. 5).

Although the Church possessed no trustworthy record of the Face of Christ, when He moved as man upon earth, the

D D 2

traditional type, adopted by artists in the middle ages, was based upon certain descriptions which are given by John of Damascus in the eighth century, and in the letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate. This latter document is usually supposed to have been fabricated in the third century, but is first given in the writings of St. Anselm, about the year 1100. St. John describes Christ as a man of lofty stature, of noble and imposing countenance, with regular features and fair curling hair. This agrees, in the main, with the fuller description given by Lentulus, the supposed President of the people of Jerusalem :

'There has appeared,' it says, 'in our times, a man of tall stature, beautiful, with a venerable countenance, which they who look on it can both love and fear. His hair is waving and crisp, somewhat wine-coloured and glittering, as it flows down over His shoulders, with a parting in the middle, after the manner of the Nazarenes. His brow is smooth and most serene ; His face is without any spot or wrinkle, and glows with a delicate flush. His nose and mouth are of faultless contour ; the beard is abundant and hazel-coloured like His hair, not long, but forked. His eyes are prominent, brilliant, and change their colour. In denunciation He is terrible, calm and loving in admonition, cheerful, but with unimpaired dignity. He has never been seen to laugh, but oftentimes to weep. His hands and limbs are beautiful to look upon. In speech He is grave, reserved, modest, and He is fair among the children of men' (p. 84).

Whether Dr. Farrar is right in assuming this letter to be a forgery of the twelfth century, it no doubt represents the traditions of earlier days, and largely influenced the conception of future artists.<sup>1</sup> The Council held at Constantinople in 842 marks the closing of the first period of early Christian art. Then iconoclasm was condemned, and the use of pictures and images was finally sanctioned by the Church. The Passion of our Lord and the sufferings of the martyrs now became common subjects, and with the general decay of art the last relics of freedom and nature disappeared. During the barren period between the ninth and thirteenth centuries, Byzantine craftsmen were content slavishly to repeat the old types and forms, and art sank to the lowest level. But although the Church laid down certain rules and traditions for the representation of sacred subjects, it is hardly fair to assume, as Dr. Farrar does, that Byzantine art was 'the reflection of

<sup>1</sup> Some interesting notes on the Lentulus letter and on Portraits of Our Lord will be found in a communication laid before the Society of Antiquaries on March 9, 1876 (see *Proceedings S. A.* vi. 503-8).

cleri  
'not  
by i  
an u

inter  
of a  
have  
107,  
sion  
that  
livin  
as n  
The  
rem

he s  
tine  
Gall  
that  
the  
rem  
'bet  
trad  
barb  
sanc

brok  
stirn  
exer  
dica  
Fran  
and  
volu  
mak  
natu  
one  
at t  
God  
noti

Rus  
the



clerical dominance,' or, as he continues, that it was subjected 'not only to the benumbing touch of conventionality, dictated by ignorant ecclesiastics, but also to the paralyzing curse of an unnatural, unscriptural, and destructive asceticism' (p. 105).

It was this asceticism, he insists, 'bringing with it arrogance, intense self-will, intolerable bigotry, and all those symptoms of a perverted, sacerdotal, and formalizing religionism, which have ever proved themselves to be the curse of nations' (p. 107), that wrought the ruin of art. But as a more dispassionate critic, Kugler, has remarked, it must be borne in mind that no Church would ever have tried to dictate to a really living art, and that the deadness of the Byzantine school was as much the cause as the effect of ecclesiastical interference. The system of repeating types had begun, Dr. Farrar should remember, long before the Church laid down her laws.

The one picture which, following Vasari and other writers, he selects as a type of the deadness and mannerism of Byzantine art, Margaritone's 'Virgin and Child' in the National Gallery, is in reality absolutely opposed to the principles of that school. 'The arrangement of the composition, and even the execution,' writes Dr. Richter, an able living critic, whose remarks are frequently quoted by Dr. Farrar in other places, 'betrays a class of workmanship which stands independent of traditions, and which is the direct offspring of the naïve but barbarous taste prevalent in Italy previous to the Renaissance.'<sup>1</sup>

When the long hours of the night were over and the dawn broke, it was the Church that gave the vivifying impulse, and stirred the dead bones into new life. The wonderful influence exercised in the development of art by the revival of the Mendicant Orders, and above all by the life and teaching of St. Francis, has been freely acknowledged by the best historians, and fully set forth of late years in Dr. Thode's admirable volume, reviewed some time back in these pages.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Farrar makes one brief allusion to this fact, but we fear, from the nature of his remarks, that this *glorioso poverello di Dio* is not one of his heroes, and that the severe ascetic spirit which lay at the root of Francis's joyous temper and tender love for God and man does not commend itself to the Archdeacon's notions.

After giving us a handful of notes and hints from Mr. Ruskin, Baron Rumohr, and other writers on the progress of the Renaissance, Dr. Farrar devotes his fourth book to Christ

<sup>1</sup> *Italian Art in the National Gallery*, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. xxvi. July 1888.

and the Virgin Mother. Under this head he glances briefly at the countless types of Madonnas and Holy Families produced by Italian painters, from Cimabue to Raphael. Many are the old favourites which he recalls, many the masterpieces of Florentine and Venetian, of Ferrarese and Lombard art which adorn his pages. Gian Bellini's calm and royal Virgins meet us here side by side with Mantegnas, and Lippis, and Luini's exquisite faces form a strange contrast to those sad-eyed, infinitely pathetic Virgins of the Florentine Sandro, which made Mr. Ruskin say, 'There is upon Botticelli's pictures at once the joy of the Resurrection and the solemnity of the grave' (p. 151). Much as we admire Dr. Farrar's selection of Madonnas, his mode of classification is, it must be owned, decidedly puzzling. Botticelli's 'Coronation of the Virgin' ought not to be placed among Mater Dolorosas, and Francia's lovely 'Madonna of the Rose Garden' is certainly not a Madone Nourrice, while both Raphael's 'Foligno Virgin' and Mantegna's 'Madonna della Vittoria' belong to the class of *ex voto* pictures, under which head Titian's great 'Pesaro Madonna' and Holbein's 'Meyer Madonna' at Darmstadt are grouped. Again, it is a mistake to place enthroned Madonnas, such as the Ansdei Raphael, the Ercole Grandi in the National Gallery, and the great Giorgione at Castelfranco in the class of pictures known as *Santa Conversazione*, a term which implies the presence of the Virgin and Saints reposing in a landscape or garden. Palma Vecchio was in reality the first inventor of this class of composition, which found such favour among the wealthy Venetians, who took delight in out-of-door life and rural scenes. And for the sake of the unlearned it is as well to mention that the fine *tondo* in the National Gallery, ascribed to Botticelli, is now recognized by the best authorities as the work of a scholar, while the lovely Venetian Madonna and Angels (at p. 174) from the sacristy of the Redentore in Venice was neither painted by Gian Bellini nor yet by Bissolo, but is the work of that interesting master, Alvise Vivarini.

All the separate currents of early Italian painting, all the leading characteristics of the Renaissance, meet in Raphael, and find full and perfect expression in his art. He is above all the painter of Madonnas, and in this respect Dr. Farrar devotes a page or two to the study of his career, and quotes Ruskin's *Modern Painters* and Gruyer's *Vierges de Raphael* on the different stages of his development. This aspect of the great Urbinate's art has lately received fuller attention, and been worthily illustrated in the volume issued by Messrs. Bell and Sons, under the title of *Raphael's Madonnas and other great*

*Pictures, reproduced from the Original Paintings; with a Life of Raphael, and an Account of his chief Works, by Karl Karòly.* Unfortunately the accompanying letterpress is distinctly meagre. Mr. Karòly's Life consists of little more than copious extracts from Vasari and Passavant, supplemented by a few remarks from Kugler and Morelli. He acknowledges Timoteo Viti to have been Raphael's first master, but repeats Vasari's baseless statement that the young artist was Pinturicchio's chief assistant in painting the frescoes of the Library at Siena, a fallacy which has been already amply exposed. In other respects he follows Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle, and, contrary to the best authorities, assigns Perugino's 'Apollo and Marsyas' in the Louvre, and the 'Madonna of the Palm' at Bridgewater House, and the 'Vision of Ezekiel' in the Pitti, to Raphael. There are also many small mistakes in Mr. Karòly's text which need to be corrected in a future edition. To give but two instances out of many: the name of Raphael's stepmother was Bernardina di Parte, and his 'Entombment' was painted for the Baglioni chapel in the church of S. Francesco, not S. Bernardino, as he has it, of Perugia.

But if the Introduction is badly done, and the notices of the pictures are brief and unsatisfactory, the scheme of the book is admirable, and the publishers deserve the cordial thanks of all students for this beautiful series of plates from Raphael's pictures. The reproductions are in all cases taken from the original works, and not from engravings, and although very unequal in merit, sufficiently recall the pictures to be of material use in the study of Raphael's successive periods. We can follow him from those Umbrian days when he painted the two Berlin Madonnas, and the lovely round of the 'Conestabile Virgin,' through the long series which belong to his Florentine and Roman time. Each group has its special beauty. The Cardellino Madonna, which he painted as a wedding present for his friend Lorenzo Nasi, is unrivalled for the grace of the grouping, the naïve charm of the child Christ and boy Baptist, and the rich loveliness of the landscape. The Madrid Virgin, with the Child astride on the lamb's back, and the parents bending lovingly over Him, is the sweetest and most winning of Holy Families, while, in spite of all adverse criticism, the great Dresden Madonna still holds its own as the most divine vision which ever dawned on mortal eyes. But among them all none are more perfect, none express the full beauty of Raphael's soul to the same extent as the first two pictures which he painted in his first year at Florence, the 'Madonna del Gran Duca,' in the Pitti, and the

less known but equally lovely little 'Virgin and Child' in Lord Cowper's collection. Both are admirably reproduced in Mr. Karòly's book, and those readers who have never visited Panshanger, as well as those who have long been familiar with this exquisite little picture will alike be grateful to Messrs. Walker and Boutall for their beautiful photogravure. It was this picture, painted in 1505, and generally known in foreign circles as 'La Petite Madone de Lord Cowper,' and *not*, as Mr. Karòly states, the later Cowper Madonna of 1508, which the great connoisseur Morelli described as the 'most lovely of all Raphael's Madonnas' (p. 92).

But we have already lingered too long over the tempting pages of this sumptuous book, and must resume the wider survey of Christian art to which Dr. Farrar invites us. His next seven chapters are devoted to different events of our Lord's life upon earth, classed under the following heads: 'The Birth at Bethlehem,' 'Incidents of the Infancy,' 'Scenes of the Ministry,' 'The Last Supper,' 'The Suffering Christ,' 'The Dead Christ,' and 'The Risen Christ.' It is a pity that in treating of this part of his subject the Archdeacon fails to see the distinction between devotional and historical representations, which should always be borne in mind. The Annunciation, the Nativity, the Crucifixion and Resurrection, and many other incidents of the Gospel story, as Mrs. Jameson and Lady Eastlake are always careful to show, are capable of being treated either as a mystery expressing some great Christian truth, or else as an event which actually took place. The mystic or devotional treatment of events in the life of our Lord was especially common in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the intention of the painter was less to represent a scene than to move spectators to devotion by the expression of some central article of the Christian faith, such as the Incarnation or the Atonement, the Resurrection from the dead, and the Life of the world to come. Of this class are those lovely 'Nativities' by Filippo Lippi and Lorenzo di Credi, by Francia and Perugino, in which the Virgin, kneeling with clasped hands, adores the Child lying on the ground at her feet. Sometimes Mary kneels on one side and Joseph on the other, sometimes the child Baptist with his cross, sometimes angels and saints, are also introduced, and the penthouse or stable with the ox and ass, and occasionally the shepherds, are seen in the background. Several fine examples of these ideal 'Nativities' are in the National Gallery. There is the famous altar-piece which Perugino painted for the Certosa of Pavia, with the archangels Michael and Raphael

on either side, and the angels singing their *Gloria* in the air. The face of the kneeling Virgin is of the fairest Umbrian type, and the glowing colours of the draperies and lovely landscapes of soft hills and distant lakes are in Perugino's best manner. And there is Pietro della Francesca's unfinished 'Nativity,' which is so noble and original an example of this great master's powers. Here five angels, crowned with roses, stand round the Holy Family, playing lute and viol, and with wide-parted lips, chanting their celestial song.

'Such music as, 'tis said,  
Before was never made,  
But when of old the sons of morning sang.'

And there is that wonderful little picture by Sandro Botticelli, which Dr. Farrar speaks of as one of the sweetest and most 'far-reaching sermons ever preached on the inmost meaning of Christmas Day' (p. 237). Here a troop of angels dance hand-in-hand on the clouds, waving myrtle and olive boughs and dangling crowns in the air in an ecstasy of joy. Three others, clad in robes of red, white, and green, sing their carols of high praise on the roof of the cattle-shed, above the manger throne, while in the foreground another group lead in the shepherds to worship the new-born King, and, falling on their necks, welcome them with rapturous embraces. The long-expected hour has come—that day foretold by prophets and kings of old, and there is joy in heaven, on earth peace and goodwill. The Greek inscription along the top tells us that this picture was painted at the end of the year 1500, in the dark days which followed on the martyrdom of Savonarola, and bears witness to the firm trust with which the Piagnone master still clung to the faith of the Frate, and believed in the fulfilment of his words and in the final triumph of good.

Dr. Farrar has wisely chosen many of his examples from the National Gallery, and gives amongst others an excellent reproduction of the interesting 'Annunciation' by Carlo Crivelli, a Venetian painter, who is remarkably well represented. Here the surroundings are curiously elaborate; a splendid Renaissance palace is introduced in the background, with rich mouldings and cornices, and an open loggia, where an Eastern carpet hangs over the edge of the balustrade, between a bird-cage on the one side and a splendid peacock on the other. He also gives us more than one specimen of the charming roundels and carved reliefs in which Tuscan sculptors of the Medici age represented the birth of their Lord, whether in stone or marble, or in the delicate blue and

white of Della Robbia ware. By far the larger number of Dr. Farrar's examples are taken from Italian art, but he has also given us several good specimens of Albert Dürer's engravings, including that delightful plate of the 'Repose in Egypt,' with Joseph handling his axe in the foreground, and a troop of tiny cherubs at play with the shavings of the carpenter's basket.

Side by side with these old Italian and German masters he places some of the finest works by our living painters—Millais' 'Carpenter's Shop' and Holman Hunt's 'Shadow of Death' and 'Triumph of the Innocents,' and those two 'Annunciations,' by Rossetti and Burne Jones. Such works as these, nobly conceived and admirably painted, deserve to rank with the great religious pictures of all times. But we are surprised that anyone should think Mr. Edwin Long's 'Anno Domini' worthy to be compared with them. The Archdeacon himself seems to have a special predilection for Mr. Holman Hunt, on whose works he dwells at some length, and to whom he has already devoted a separate monograph. Besides the great pictures, with which we are all of us familiar, he gives us an interesting plate of 'Christ among the Doctors,' from a water-colour design for a mosaic in the chapel at Clifton College. Here our Lord, wearing a white tunic and leather girdle—the common dress of the Galilee peasant—is seen kneeling on one knee in the centre of a group of Rabbis in one of the Temple halls. The doctors, seated around, are all intended for historical personages—Jonathan Ben Uzziel, the author of the Targum, the young Gamaliel, and other Jewish Rabbis noted for their learning. In the midst of these wise men the fair boy Christ, with His blue eyes and curling locks of bright red gold, kneels with a thoughtful and earnest air. One hand is raised to His forehead in reverent attention, the other holds a scroll on which we read the Hebrew words from Isaiah, 'He shall grow up before Him like a tender plant.' Like all Mr. Holman Hunt's works, this picture is painted with close attention to the customs and dresses of the East, and is throughout inspired by the noble seriousness and high purpose of a painter who has himself told us that to him 'the story of the New Testament is not merely a Reality, not merely the greatest of Realities, but the only Reality' (p. 297).

Before entering on the Scenes of our Lord's Ministry, Dr. Farrar mentions a few series of paintings in which the successive events of the life of Christ are represented. Such are the thirty-six New Testament subjects in mosaic, with which



the Gothic king Theodoric adorned the nave of the great basilica of S. Apollinare Nuovo of Ravenna, in the first years of the sixth century. Here the story of the Birth and Childhood are left out, and thirteen subjects on the left wall represent the miracles and parables of our Lord, while the other thirteen on the opposite wall give the history of His Passion and Resurrection. Throughout the series our Lord and His disciples appear clad in classical robes, while the other actors in the scene are attired in contemporary costume, differing according to their rank and station. The Pharisee wears the dress of a rich young Byzantine youth, the publican and blind man that of the lower orders, and the single disciple who is introduced in each subject as the representative of the Twelve, is robed in a white mantle embroidered with gold, and wears sandals on his feet. In these mosaics the parables of the Sheep and Goats, of the Draught of Fishes and Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Widow's Mite and the Raising of Lazarus, are all represented. We see the sick of the palsy let down by ropes through the roof in his bed, and that still rarer subject the miracle of Gadara. The demoniac upon whom the cure has been wrought kneels at the feet of our Lord, 'clothed and in his right mind,' in front of the yawning cave that recalls his dwelling among the tombs, and in the background the swine are seen running violently down the steep cliff into the sea. In the scenes from the Passion, the Crucifixion and Burial are omitted; and whether in the judgment-hall of Pilate and Herod or on His way to Golgotha, our Lord's aspect is still that of a king and ruler of men. As in the former series, He wears the purple mantle and flowing robe of Roman times, and the power of a supernatural presence is fully realized. Dr. Farrar alludes to two or three of these subjects in other parts of his book, but omits the series in his account of consecutive scenes from the Life of Christ. Neither does he mention that other most interesting series by the sculptor Andrea Pisano and his followers, the bas-reliefs on the façade of the Duomo of Orvieto. There two angels are introduced in each scene as spectators, whose faces reflect the joy or sadness of the moment. They kneel with reverently folded palms as the archangel delivers his heaven-sent word, they clasp their uplifted hands in mingled awe and terror as they follow Christ step by step through His bitter agony; they veil their faces in anguish before the Cross, and gaze in a rapture of adoring love on the glorified form of their risen Lord.

We cannot dwell here on the long series of glorious

paintings in which Giotto represented the life of Christ, first in the convent church of Assisi, then again in the Arena Chapel of Padua. Nor can we linger over the heavenly loveliness of Fra Angelico's pictures in the cells of his own convent of San Marco. They are familiar to us all, and will live for ever as the pure dreams of that gentle and holy soul who walked with God, and saw that the world was very good. Some of his types have never been excelled by the artists of a riper age. The majestic Christ standing with outstretched arms on the Mount of Transfiguration, while the disciples, on their knees at His feet, shade their eyes from the brightness of His presence; the radiant angel at the sepulchre, pointing calmly towards the glorious form floating upwards in the dim twilight of the Resurrection morning, remain unsurpassed in the annals of Italian art. Leonardo's ruined fresco in the refectory of Santa Maria delle Grazie at Milan has, in Dr. Farrar's words, 'dwarfed the significance of all others' (p. 347); and yet Fra Angelico's version of the subject has a solemn beauty and meaning of its own. The actual institution of the Eucharist is the moment which he has chosen. The Apostles kneel devoutly at the long table, covered with its white cloth. A row of three-legged wooden stools stand round the board, as in the convent refectory, and our Lord moves silently down the line, bearing the consecrated wafer in His hand.

Dr. Farrar devotes a separate chapter to the suffering Christ as treated by Albrecht Dürer, and illustrates it with six engravings from the Nuremberg master's 'Greater Passion,' which are the best reproductions in the whole book. Foremost among them is the wonderful Man of Sorrows which adorns the title-page of the series, and which in its heart-stirring pathos rivals even the *Pietà*'s of Giovanni Bellini. 'The Crucifixion' of the 'Greater Passion,' with the angels hovering in mid air, the Mother fainting in the arms of the holy women, and the Roman centurion on horseback, is an impressive work, stamped with that deep sincerity and feeling which were the distinctive feature of the Teutonic master's genius. But there is another 'Crucifixion' by Dürer, which leaves a still deeper impression on the mind. It is the little picture in the Dresden Gallery, which he painted during his visit to Venice in 1506. Here the dying Christ, hanging on the Cross, breathes out His soul to God in the words, 'Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum.' There is no crowd of spectators, no sorrowing disciples or fierce soldiery, only that solitary form on the Cross, and far away,

beyond the feathery trees and distant hills of the landscape, the warm glow of the sunset lingers in the evening sky.

Luini's well-known fresco of the 'Crucifixion,' on the wall of the Church of Santa Maria degli Angioli, at Lugano, is a very striking and interesting work, including as it does the Last Supper, the Agony in the Garden, and the earlier scenes of the Passion on one side, and the Entombment, Resurrection, and different appearances of the Risen Lord on the other; while Tintoretto's wonderful 'Crucifixion' in the Scuola di San Rocco, at Venice, remains unequalled for mysterious grandeur of conception and perfect rendering of details. 'I must leave this picture,' writes Mr. Ruskin, 'to work its will on the spectator; for it is beyond all analysis and above all praise' (p. 415). Velasquez, on the other hand, brings out the awful gloom and desolation of the scene in his picture of Christ hanging alone on the Cross, bearing the sins of the world. But none of these move us as profoundly as Michelangelo's drawings of the Crucifixion. The actual example to which Dr. Farrar refers—the sketch in the Taylor Museum at Oxford—is probably a copy, but the conception is clearly Michelangelo's own. All the intensity of the great artist's nature, all the power and passion of his genius, is present in this suffering and dying Christ, breathing out His soul to God. The Cross stands alone on the bare hill-top, and on either side are two angels, sharply foreshortened, after the artist's wont. One, resting his chest on his hand and leaning both arms on the clouds, gazes with streaming tears on the face of Christ, the other points with one hand to the Cross, and turns his head away as if unable to bear the sight.

The original of this sketch was probably the very crucifix which Michelangelo designed for his noble friend, Vittoria Colonna, and for which she thanked him in the following letter:

'I have seen now that all is possible to him who believes. I had the greatest faith in God that He would bestow upon you supernatural grace for the making of this Christ. When I came to examine it, I found it so marvellous, that it surpasses all my expectations. The design is in all parts perfect and consummate, and one could not desire more. I tell you that I am mightily pleased that the angel on the right hand is by far the fairer, since Michael will place you, Michelagnolo, upon the right hand of our Lord at that last day.'<sup>1</sup>

But there are many other sketches of 'Crucifixions' and *Pietà's* in the public and private collections of Europe which

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of Michelangelo Buonarroti*, by J. A. Symonds, ii. 105.

belong to the last years of the great master's life, and show the thoughts that filled his mind when he felt near to God and face to face with death.

Dr. Farrar's chapter on the Last Judgment, as represented in art, is, we regret to say, even more full of mistakes than the rest of his book. He speaks at p. 460 of Giotto's 'Last Judgment' in Santa Maria Novella of Florence, when we know his only rendering of the subject is the ruined wall-painting in the Arena Chapel at Padua; he still persists in ascribing to Orcagna the great fresco of the Campo Santo, which bears no traces of that painter's hand, and gives us no account of his 'Last Judgment' in Santa Maria Novella. And he makes no mention of the noble bas-reliefs on the west front of Wells and Orvieto, which are among the earliest and finest representations of the *Dies Iræ* in mediæval art. One interesting peculiarity in the treatment of this subject is the way in which the original type of Christ, the Judge of all, as seen in old Greek mosaics and mediæval manuscripts, was preserved throughout the Renaissance. The Christ of Michelangelo's 'Last Judgment' retains the same attitude as the *Rex tremendæ majestatis*, whose form is still dimly seen in the mosaics of Torcello, or on the walls of the Campo Santo, in Fra Bartolommeo's ruined fresco at S. Maria Nuova, or in the paintings with which Fra Angelico adorned the presses of the Annunziata. One hand is raised to show the print of the nails, the other points to the pierced side, according to the passage in the Book of the Revelation, 'Behold, He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him.' Mrs. Jameson points out what Dr. Farrar apparently fails to grasp—the great theological idea expressed in this ancient tradition, 'the meaning being that the wounds conveyed their respective sentences to the assembled children of men, according as they had previously accepted or rejected these signs of the Atonement—"to the one the savour of death unto death, to the others of life unto life."' <sup>1</sup> From the earliest times the Twelve Apostles are introduced seated on thrones on either side, St. Peter, holding the keys, being always on the right hand of Christ. The Virgin appears in the earlier representations, as, for instance, in the Campo Santo fresco, crowned and throned, at the side of her Son, in an almond-

<sup>1</sup> *The History of Our Lord, as exemplified in Works of Art*, commenced by the late Mrs. Jameson, completed by Lady Eastlake, ii. 398.

shaped glory of a smaller size. But in the Strozzi Chapel of S. Maria Novella she kneels, robed in white, at the right hand of Christ, as if pleading for mercy. In Fra Angelico's 'Last Judgment,' and in later versions of the subject, she is seated with hands folded meekly on her breast, at the side of the Apostles, but nearest to our Lord, while St. John the Baptist is placed on the other side. The angels, whether they are represented sounding the trump of doom, wielding the scales, or parting the sheep and the goats, are always prominent actors in the scene. In the Campo Santo fresco the mighty Angel of Judgment stands erect, displaying in either hand a scroll inscribed with the words *Venite, Benedicti Patris*, and *Ite, Maledicti*. Two other seraphs, on either side, blow the trumpets to wake the dead, and at his feet the Angel of Mercy cowers with his face half hidden at the awful sight. In Fra Angelico's 'Last Judgment' angels circle in mystic dances on the flowery meadows of Paradise, and clasp the happy dead, just waking out of sleep, in their embraces. In Luca Signorelli's magnificent frescoes at Orvieto they are strong-limbed, joyous beings, who dance on the clouds of heaven, with long yellow locks streaming on the breeze, or bend from their heights of bliss to crown the blessed souls whose wondering eyes have opened on the vision of God.

Archdeacon Farrar concludes with a final chapter on the Ideals of Christ in Art, and avails himself of this opportunity for a parting attack on those days, when art was misled by 'perverted religious teachings—Gloom, Asceticism, Wrath, Fear, Effeminacy, Pharisaism, Priestcraft.' He repeats, 'These have been the most powerful and the most deadly corrupters of the true ideal of the Lord of Life and Love' (p. 482). From the eleventh to the sixteenth century, he tells us, the images of Christ are always severe and sad, dominated by 'that spirit of exaggerated, unchristian, and unspiritual asceticism borrowed from the East' (p. 484). But it is to these very ages of darkness and superstition that we owe the sculptured figure on the west front of Amiens Cathedral which adorns the title-page of his book, and which Mr. Ruskin selects as the noblest ideal of our Lord. In that *Beau Dieu d'Amiens* we see Him surrounded by the great company which no man can number 'as the Incarnate Word, as the present Friend, as the Prince of Peace on Earth, and as the Everlasting King in Heaven. He holds the Book of the Eternal Law in His left hand; with his

right He blesses, but blesses on condition. "This do, and thou shalt live."<sup>1</sup>

This was the message which the art of Italy had to give from the time of Cimabue to that of Raphael. The life and death of Christ, the Incarnate God, was the subject which the artists of the Renaissance set forth in the eyes of successive generations, the theme which they sought to represent with ever-increasing knowledge and widening vision in those days when the faith of Christ was still a living power. And, in spite of the crudeness and imperfections of their work, they have left us a goodly heritage, and their mosaics, their frescoes, their pictures have become, not only the *Biblia pauperum* of their own day, but the school and the treasure-house of the wise in every age.

'The Life and Gospel and the Power of it are all written in the mighty works of its true believers . . . on the rocks of Orvieto, and by the sands of Arno. . . . Believe it or not, reader, as you will ; understand only how thoroughly it *was* once believed, and that all beautiful things were made and all brave deeds done in the strength of it.'<sup>2</sup>

#### ART. VII.—THE SCIENCE OF CHURCH MISSIONS.

1. *Reports of the Boards of Missions of the Provinces of Canterbury and York on the Mission Field.* Published under the direction of the Tract Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. (London, 1894.)
2. *The Official Report of the Missionary Conference of the Anglican Communion on May 28, 29, 30, and June 1, 1894.* Edited by GEORGE A. SPOTTISWOODE. (London, 1894.)
3. *Essay on the Prevailing Methods of the Evangelization of the Non-Christian World.* By ROBERT NEEDHAM CUST, LL.D. (London, 1894.)

THERE can be no doubt that we are entering upon a new phase in the history of the foreign missions connected with the Anglican Communion. The causes which are leading to this development are various ; some of them are distinctly ecclesiastical, others are resultants of the material and social advance of a civilization which is progressing with unexampled rapidity ; others again arise from the inevitable extension of

<sup>1</sup> *The Bible of Amiens*, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 58.



an empire which is ever spreading beyond the utmost ambition of its rulers. For good or for evil the English Church and nation is touching at almost innumerable points the commerce and the creeds of every quarter of the world outside the continent of Europe ; and lands a century ago utterly inaccessible, continents then unknown, islands then, some dense with pirate hordes, others scattered in groups over the enormous area of the Pacific, have been made the homes of the English missionary, and at least a fraction of their people have been brought within the fold of the Anglican Communion. Simultaneously with this wondrous outward expansion the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic has been providentially led to a fuller and deeper sense of its corporate life and its consequent responsibilities than it could have felt three generations ago. Can any thoughtful person fail to recognize a Divine purpose in the contemporaneous occurrence of things so utterly dissociated from each other as that extended application of steam and electricity which annihilates time and space on the one hand, and the revival of Convocation, the marvellous extension of the colonial episcopate, and the decennial meetings of the Lambeth Conference on the other ? Hackneyed and self-evident as these observations may appear, they must be borne in mind if we would realize the actual position of the missions of the Church. The whole subject is advancing from the stage of isolated effort to that of united thought and action, and the works named at the head of our paper are striking indications of the fact. It is hardly too much to say that they mark an epoch in the history of Church Missions.

There is no necessity to recount the well-known origin of the boards of missions of the provinces of Canterbury and York. They were appointed in compliance with resolutions passed by both Convocations ; and although independent of each other, they act in entire harmony, and divide the Church mission field between them. The first-fruits of their united labours are now before us, and it would be difficult to exaggerate their value. The boards of missions have taken a broad and comprehensive view of their duties, and the *Reports* here presented include statistics of the progress made by all other religious denominations, as well as by the Church of England. The area, population, and languages of each of the seven regions into which the entire mission field is divided are first set out ; the organization, education, and discipline of the several Church provinces, and of the dioceses which they include are next concisely but adequately described ; the special problems of each country, with the encouragements or discouragements

ragements which it suggests, are then detailed, as well as any openings for further missionary effort. In a series of appendices information of the highest interest, which has hitherto been scattered through a multitude of volumes, is gathered together in a convenient form, and a practical acquaintance with the contents of many missionary reports and papers enables us to speak in terms of high commendation of the manner in which the committee have accomplished their most laborious task. We question whether any other volume of 250 pages contains an account so full, so varied, and so well put together of Christian Missions throughout the world. Of the sections embraced in the *Reports*, that which treats of India is the most ample, that assigned to Africa seems to us proportionately the most meagre. Of course it is not claimed for these *Reports* that they are final or complete. But few will venture to question the Bishop of Durham's assertion in the preface that they supply a solid foundation for future labour, and afford as a whole a comprehensive and impressive view of the foreign missions of the English Church.

The Missionary Conference of last May, whose *Report* stands second on our list,<sup>1</sup> was designed as a consultative congress by the boards of missions; and although similar conferences of a mixed character have been held both at home and abroad, this was the first meeting of Anglican missionaries from all parts of the world to confer with one another on their work. Upwards of 2,500 members were enrolled, yet the importance of the Conference is not to be measured by the number, but by the standing, of those who took part in it. It was essentially a gathering of experts, of those who have practical acquaintance with missions in their home administration and on the foreign battle-field of the faith; of the leaders of thought on the episcopal bench, both home and foreign, and of the workers who have borne the burden and heat of the day. Such a combination was absolutely unique, and would assuredly cast new light on questions that demand all the highest powers of Church statesmanship.

Almost simultaneously with the *Report* of the Church Missionary Conference, there appeared Dr. Cust's *Essay on the Prevailing Methods of the Evangelization of the Non-Christian World*. The author of this elaborate indictment claims public attention to his views by announcing on his title-page that he

<sup>1</sup> The skill, ability, and zeal which Mr. George Spottiswoode—that most indefatigable of Churchmen—has shown in editing this portly volume demand the most grateful and cordial acknowledgments of every well-wisher to the missionary cause.

is an observer in the field, a member of committees, an all-round teacher of missionary literature in five European languages, and one whose heart and intellect have been devoted to the subject for fifty years, independent of Church, denomination, or nationality. Of Dr. Cust's transparent honesty of intention we entertain no question. That he is a devoted friend of missions, a generous and warm-hearted man, of untiring industry and wide experience, all will admit, yet we venture to question the judgment of publishing the *Essay* before us. Does one of the three mottoes printed on his title-page really represent Dr. Cust's deliberate verdict upon existing missionary methods—*Sunt bona, sunt quædam mediocria, sunt mala plura*? If so, amongst all the friends of English missions we are persuaded that he stands alone. No doubt faults and blemishes sadly mar work in the mission field, as they do work in every other branch of Christian effort. No doubt human weakness and folly sully the records of the planting of Christianity in the nineteenth, as they did in the first and second centuries. No doubt, now as then, some preach Christ even of envy and strife, and occasionally those that rule 'have to be blamed,' and a weary heart, saddened by suffering, may be tempted to think and to say, 'all seek their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's.' No doubt healthy and timely criticism, however painful, like the faithful wounds of a friend, may be absolutely necessary under certain critical conditions. But our misgiving is whether Dr. Cust's criticism is altogether healthy or timely. Much that his book of 300 pages contains is matter of fair open discussion, wherein difference of opinion is to be expected, and its utterance cannot wound any sensibilities. Much again is of considerable value as the result of wide experience as an Indian ruler and statesman, expressed with all the vigour and directness of one who has the courage of his opinions. On many important points hereafter to be mentioned we are entirely in accord with Dr. Cust, and have to thank him for the singular lucidity with which he maintains his conclusions. But when so much has been allowed, there remains a considerable portion of the *Essay* which we can only regard with serious regret. Was it absolutely necessary—and nothing short of necessity could justify it—after sitting so long in the seat of a staunch supporter, and having there set down all the little faults he observed, thus to publish them *urbi et orbi*? Upon very many of the points he raises—mere questions of taste and phraseology—would not private remonstrance, even though ineffectual, have sufficed? On others

we think an ex-committeeman might perhaps have felt that his lips were sealed.

The true significance and value of a missionary conference of the Anglican Communion lies in the exceptional responsibility which in God's providence is laid upon our branch of the Catholic Church at the present time. The keynote was rightly struck by the Bishop of Durham in his inaugural sermon, and its tone was maintained clear and sharp to the last.

'Our empire' (said Dr. Westcott), 'and the forces of character by which our empire has been gained and is now held, were not given us for ourselves, for the satisfaction of our own interests and ambitions, but for human ministry. Nations are formed for brotherhood, each according to its place. Nations are disciplined for service, each according to its gifts. God has set us to be not only conquerors, or pioneers, or masters, or furnishers of the outward materials of civilization, but above all Evangelists. The call is written in our history' (p. 3).

The duty thus laid on us as a people is further enforced by the unique advantage which we Anglicans enjoy in the existence of a National Church which is Catholic, Apostolic, and Scriptural. 'If the British nation,' writes the same prelate, whose pen is at once so prolific and so suggestive on missionary topics, 'is providentially fitted to be the mother of nations, the English Church is no less fitted to be the fruitful mother of Churches. It combines reverence for order with capacity for progress. It is able to assimilate new truths and to quicken old and decaying traditions with fresh energy.'<sup>1</sup> It thus occupies a position of exceptional advantage for dealing with the Oriental Churches, because it can approach them with sympathy for their standing as inheritors of the primitive faith, which they have never formally abandoned, with respect for their independence, which they will never willingly forfeit, and with help towards their efforts to rise from a degradation of which they are becoming increasingly conscious. Such assistance, however, is not to be proffered rashly, nor in the truest interests of the faith should well-meaning but short-sighted intruders besiege the lands where, even in sadly imperfect conditions, Oriental Christians have maintained their faith for centuries against the fiercest persecution. 'I know but little about Christ, but I am ready to die for Him,' was the remark of a Nestorian to an English traveller. What must such a people, animated by passionate devotion to its apostolic liturgy, to its ancient rites, and to its hereditary episcopate, think of the proselytizing agents who aim at the

<sup>1</sup> *Reports of Boards of Missions*, p. 11.

further weakening of its scanty numbers by perversions to the Roman or Presbyterian communities which hold such precious, even though distorted, relics of primitive Christianity in utter disregard? It is true, as the Primate with deep feeling said, we cannot look without grief upon many of the Churches which date from the very earliest periods, and there is much in their prevalent habits and beliefs to occasion distress. And we are entirely in harmony with his Grace when he added:

'It is quite clear that if there is anything to be done for those Churches (as I am certain there is), it cannot be done by societies. The societies, however great they are, however rich, however powerful, however capable, are not on the same footing as Churches; and when societies come in contact with other Churches their work will not be very much prospered. The only power that can deal with Churches at large is a great Church which has its own deep historic footing, and its great connection with the whole Catholic world.'<sup>1</sup>

The question of the relations of the Anglican Communion with Oriental Churches is but one out of a number of difficult and delicate problems which arise from time to time in the mission field. As the influence of the English Church advances in foreign lands subjects frequently occur which need the most careful home guidance. Some of these concern internal Church organization and discipline; others affect the position of missionaries and their converts with regard to native or intruded authorities; others touch matters of what Dr. Cust terms 'intra-mission comity, whether Protestant or Romish.' Such matters can only be satisfactorily determined through a clear grasp of great leading principles and their skilful adaptation to each emergency as it arises. They cannot be decided by abstract truisms. It is very easy, for example, to lay down the unqualified maxim that a missionary should have nothing whatever to do with the secular authority; that he should rely at all hazards on the Divine protection, and not upon the arm of the flesh. But circumstances arose in which even the great Apostle of the Gentiles thought it right to assert his Roman citizenship at Philippi and to claim an appeal to Cæsar against the judgment of Festus; and cases may occur in which the most devoted and self-sacrificing would rightly discern and seek the Divine protection through the secular power. Is it casting any reflection upon the secretaries and committees of Missionary Societies to say that under circumstances so difficult as those which recently occurred in Uganda—circumstances, be it remem-

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference, &c., pp. 14-15.*

bered, which led to an appeal for the intervention of the British Government—their position would have been materially strengthened if it had been ratified by the support of a board of missions, where they would naturally have held a position of great influence, and which was known to represent the Church at large?

Let us take one or two illustrations of the evils which arise under the existing state of things as illustrated by certain facts which were stated at the Conference. It should be remembered that the Conference itself was arranged by the Boards of Missions of the two Houses of Convocation; that it was approved by the Church's principal guides, of whom no less than thirty-two prelates, including the Primate with the Bishops of London, Winchester, Durham, Gloucester, took part in the proceedings; that it met avowedly for mutual information and comparison of missionary methods; and that experts of all shades of opinion were invited to join. Yet, Mr. Sydney Gedge declared that some of his friends—men avowedly and conspicuously interested in missions—refused on grounds of doctrinal difference to have anything to do with it. Oh the pity of it! and can anyone question that the existence of party missionary societies—by the mere fact of their existence—helps to intensify and deepen these 'our unhappy divisions' to the hindrance of the extension of Christ's kingdom? A yet more flagrant scandal, for we can call it nothing else, was mentioned by a volunteer speaker. An incumbent enters on the charge of a parish in which energetic missionary work has been carried on by his predecessor, but not in union with the society which the new vicar prefers. Forthwith all the existing arrangements—the result, we may confidently trust, of much labour and love and prayer—are completely upset, the whole missionary agency in the parish is discarded, the meetings discontinued, the collectors disbanded, and everything is begun *de novo*. Even when there is no such visible rupture the rival Church Societies overlap each other and occasionally clash. The fault does not lie with the practical managers of the Missionary Societies, who conduct their mutual relations with the courtesy of gentlemen and in the spirit of Christians. It lies in the system which has gradually and unintentionally grown up of committing the foreign missions of the Church to committees responsible to those who furnish them with funds, and who are therefore impelled to reproduce their tendencies and tastes; whilst they are not swayed by those wider conceptions of duty which result from being in touch,



not with one section of the Church, but with all its divisions in turn.

Such a state of things is assuredly not an ideal one. Yet these disadvantages are but of minor import as compared with others at which the Archbishop could only direct a rapid glance. The greatest problem of the mission field is the conversion of Islam, and this is inextricably bound up, in its cradle lands, with the condition of the Eastern Churches. Even as we write this far-reaching subject is occupying the most earnest attention of the Pontiff of the Latin Church, and we may be sure that no resource of diplomacy will be left untried to win if possible the Oriental Catholics to the Roman obedience. No steps, we are persuaded, would present a greater hindrance to the successful prosecution of missionary work amongst Mohammedans than the development of modern Romanism in their midst. But the establishment and maintenance of such improved relations between the Anglican Communion and the ancient Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Nestorian Churches, as may lead to their gradual elevation to a higher standard of knowledge and life will need very special delicacy of handling, and could hardly be accomplished by the agency of any voluntary society.

The hint thrown out by Dr. Benson in his inaugural address was worked out more fully in a paper on 'Administration' by Bishop Anson; and it would, we think, be impossible to dispute the beauty and truth of the ideal he upheld, however distant we may deem its realization.

'I consider,' he said, 'that the Church at home ought to have, as a body, very definite relations to its Missions; and as far as I know it has no such relations at present; that the Church ought to regard the evangelization of the heathen world as one of her first and chief duties; that in some official, representative, and therefore authoritative manner, she ought to plan and organize the great work, and call upon her people, as a matter of primary duty, to help her to carry out that commission which her Lord has given her; that she ought to send forth those who feel the Holy Spirit's call to give themselves to the work with the benediction and the distinct authoritative commission to the work of her chief pastors; that she ought to provide adequate means of training for the young to whose hearts God may speak, making them desire to go forth in His name, but who have no worldly means of their own, and homes and refuges for the aged and worn-out labourers who have borne the burden and heat of the day, such as the monasteries of old time afforded, whether for the young or the aged; that, in short, the Church ought to show plainly and distinctly that this work is her work—the most essential, the most

honourable, to which she can devote herself, and call and send her children. It is certainly not so as things are now.' <sup>1</sup>

The principles thus enunciated have the almost unanimous support of the episcopal bench, and were urged years ago with all the authority of Bishop Selwyn in Convocation. He held that the confessed inadequacy of Church contributions to foreign missions and their sad disproportion to the offerings made by all classes amongst the Dissenting communities were largely due to the fact that Churchmen do not base their appeal for missions on the highest of all principles. 'Go,' he said, 'into any diocese or parish, and you will find that instead of Christian people believing it to be their bounden duty to support Christian missions, the whole thing is looked upon as entirely optional whether they should support the S. P. G. or C. M. S., or neither. We want to strike a higher note.'

The position thus taken up is the strongest which those who advocate some modification of the Church's missionary agency can occupy, and it is hardly worth while now to enter upon minor points of criticism of the existing system. In a task of such extreme difficulty and complexity it is well to remember the maxim of the great Duke of Wellington: 'He is not the greatest general who makes no mistakes, but he who makes the fewest.' The one thing needful is to awaken the widest possible interest in mission work throughout the Church, and to secure the services of her ablest and most enthusiastic sons—her geniuses, if you will—for the extension of Christ's kingdom in heathen lands. On this latter head at least our mission roll-call is one which no Church or system could regard without thankfulness and pride. The chronicles of a single century which glitter with the names of Henry Martyn, and Schwartz, and Selwyn, and Mackenzie, and Gray, and Patteson, and Hannington, and French, and Caldwell, and Field, and Horden, and Steere, and Callaway—to take only those which instantly suggest themselves—may bear comparison with any other similar period in Church history for sanctified ability and self-sacrificing devotion. Of scores besides who counted not their lives dear to themselves for our blessed Redeemer's sake, and whose graves lie scattered over far-off continents and islands, the time would fail us to tell. Let us rather hear what the advocates of the Societies had to urge in reply to what they seem to have regarded as an invitation to 'happy despatch.'

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference, &c.*, p. 513.

The extension of Church missions through the agency of voluntary associations—so they argue—accords with the spirit and genius both of the English Church and Constitution, which has been wont to rely rather on the spontaneous energy than on the prescribed action of her members. The Church Missionary Society originated in this way, and although it asked for official recognition, after long and patient waiting, it received only a chilling reply. With its elder sister, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, it has passed through every stage of discouragement from the civil and ecclesiastical authority, of undisguised contempt from a misguided public opinion, and of inveterate suspicion from those whose hands it would have materially, although indirectly, strengthened in upholding the honour of England. It has passed through all these stages, preserving the even tenor of its way, and now, when it has by patient endurance and by results which can no longer be denied, won for itself and for the cause of missions the attention which the whole subject now commands, with what justice can any alleged failures and deficiencies be laid to its charge? To talk of the corporate action of the Church is to attribute unanimity and energy to a mere abstraction, or at best to a colourless committee—for in any case missionary work and administration would have to be conducted through committees—which would never succeed in kindling the zeal indispensable to the task.

It is here in truth that the supporters of the *status in quo* hold a position which seems to us almost impregnable. The Church of England embraces within its ample boundaries followers widely different from the uniform, we had almost written abject, submission of the Church of Rome, or from the dead level of a narrow sectarianism: and the different lines of thought and conviction find their appropriate channel of action in the society which most fully sympathizes with their views. We may deplore the existence of separate parties and of party spirit within the Church's bosom. We may wish that all Churchmen could see in all things eye to eye, but so desirable a consummation is not as yet within measurable distance, and meanwhile it is the intensity of individual conviction which prompts to the self-sacrifice and devotion which are the life's blood of missions. The mission societies, at any rate, are at the present moment the recognized outlets for a deep but chastened enthusiasm which half a century ago would have seemed the wildest of dreams, and which has wrought by God's good grace some splendid results. Beware how you close them; you may run the risk of quenching the Spirit at home as

well as of starving the Church abroad. Nor are these the arguments of one side only. They are pressed with equal earnestness by Mr. Berdmore Compton and Mr. Sydney Gedge. They are based on the traditions and memories of many generations. They are sustained by the invaluable world-wide prestige of institutions that have struck root in every quarter of the world. 'What can be expected,' asks Mr. Compton, 'from the appeals of a central body which artificially combines all the artificial hues of an artificial spectrum into one dull neutral grey which nobody likes?' 'What Board of Missions,' urges Mr. Gedge, 'could have given the immediate response which the Church Missionary Society gave to the cry from Uganda, or could have raised 16,000*l.* in a fortnight to cover a deficit of 13,000*l.*?' And he finally quotes the Archbishop of Canterbury's own words to describe what is the Church's duty towards missions:

'The Church is bound to strengthen the societies which have made the era all their own by their devotion and their skill. She is bound to strengthen them with her very deepest life. She is bound to strengthen them that they may strengthen the nations which are coming to the birth.'<sup>1</sup>

Such are the main outlines of a controversy on which the last word has not yet been spoken. The present system of Church missionary agency assuredly is not an ideal one; and if it be true, as one of the speakers asserted, that 'the best is ever the enemy of the good,' yet the best should still be upheld as an ideal at which the Church should aim. A concentration of the smaller missionary agencies, a clearer recognition of the legitimate supremacy of colonial Church authorities, lay and clerical, and their necessarily superior acquaintance with local needs over a London committee; an extension of the system of block grants already so largely adopted by the S. P. G., and a strenuous whole-hearted effort to raise up independent native Churches rather than to retain them in the leading-strings pulled by English rulers; a continuance of the labours of the boards of missions, as at once widely representative and independent, and wielding a moral, intellectual, and spiritual influence—these are very practical suggestions, which might help to bring about no little advantage to the mission cause. No one wants to extinguish or discourage voluntary societies; but it is desirable that the men whom they send out should feel that they have the Church, not merely a society, behind them. We have already, thanks to

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference, &c.*, p. 524.

the work of the great missionary societies, attained to some sense of our responsibility as individual Churchmen; we want to take one further step, and this we ardently trust with Bishop Barry the Board of Missions may effect.

'It should make,' he said, 'our Church people feel through the length and breadth of the land—what they do not feel adequately now—that while it is a matter of option to them whether they will join this or that society, it is a matter of solemn and moral obligation on every man who calls himself a Christian and a Churchman to do something to manifest his Church membership by extending the borders of the kingdom of God.'<sup>1</sup>

Was it any unconscious shrinking from a stirring of the question which underlies missionary work at home, as the vocation and training of the missionary underlies all successful labour abroad, which led the managers to postpone its discussion until the last day of the Conference? Its meetings were a sign that a second stage has been reached in the history of Church missions. The day of merely isolated action, of solitary though devoted experiment, of eager but uninformed and reckless enterprise, has passed, and the time has come for concerted work upon lines which dear-bought experience prescribes. How wildly extravagant are some missionary schemes even at the present moment the readers of Dr. Cust's pamphlet will learn, as, we think, to their intense amazement. The United States are the starting-point of some experiments which almost verge on lunacy. Yet it is only through practical experience at the cost of many precious lives—not wasted, because freely spent in the highest of all services—that the subject of missions could be treated now upon a scientific basis; a fact which the Primate brought into fitting prominence.

'The scientific study of missions is a thing which is beginning and could only begin, not merely after certain ideas had come to be held by the minds of a few great thinkers, but after people in general had got some idea of the philosophy of history. Then and not till then could there possibly arise any idea of the scientific study of missions. Things which belong to it have been thought of now and then in a fragmentary way, but a great comprehensive study of missions can come only at a certain period of the Church's history. It has not been the business of the societies to do it. It has been their business to take the faith and plant it here and there by the best agents they could, and with the utmost liberality. But the scientific study of it, as a great historical subject, a perception, a view of the enormous importance of the idea of missions, such a social picture of the Church in comparison with the other thoughts of men as is pre-

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference*, p. 545.

sented to us in that book, *Social Evolution*—all that belongs to a period that has begun, but has not yet reached its height ; and this Conference, I take it, is unique in that it is the first general gathering of people devoted to and interested in missions, who desire to form philosophical, historical ideas of what missions are and whereunto they are growing, and how their growth is to be helped in the best way by a grand comparison of results.<sup>1</sup>

The variety and importance of the subjects selected for discussion, and the authority and experience of those who were invited to read papers upon them, did not belie the Primate's high estimate of the Conference. The missionary's vocation and training, the false religions to be dealt with, the presentation of Christianity, the weighty problems—Indian, Chinese, Japanese, African, Australian—to be discussed ; the moot points of polygamy and caste ; the special dangers to be avoided, and the methods to be employed ; how best to build up the Church through internal organization and discipline, with native agencies and episcopate ; how rightly to maintain its relations to the Church at home—all these, and besides them educational missions, medical missions, and women's work in the mission field—the bare enumeration of such titles indicates how manifold and how deep are the questions with which modern missionary enterprise has to grapple. There is not one of them which does not demand the most earnest thought, the utmost patience, and the soundest judgment for its solution.

At the foundation of all successful endeavour lies the securing of men and women duly qualified for so difficult a task, and as we read the various requirements, brought out in detail one after another by different speakers, we might almost be tempted to despair. 'No inferior men will do for the colonies' is the burden of their cry who have practical acquaintance with clerical work in our Australian settlements, and we recollect that Bishop Moorhouse, at the Manchester Church Congress, described a colonial bishop as a man who had to attend to urgent practical duties all day and to study deep scientific and intellectual questions through half the night. Savage races require men of the widest sympathy as well as of unfailing godliness to sustain them under conditions more calculated to degrade the civilized Christian than to elevate the natives to a higher level. The cultured and refined Eastern, on the other hand, is often shocked by a brusqueness of manner which, in his eyes, is not redeemed by spiritual gifts which he has not learned to value, and which, as he identifies it with

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference*, p. 14.



the pride of a dominant people, cannot fail to be singularly galling. The subtlety of Hindu metaphysics, the stern monotheism of Mohammedan fanaticism, the tolerant atheism of the Buddhist devotee, and the distorted nature-worship of the Polynesian idolater cannot be dealt with on one uniform system, and the missionary, to be effective, must have a home training which shall fit him for the special branch of work to which he is called, as well as some natural aptitude for it. If delay in the supply of missionaries involves the sacrifice of opportunities which may never again be ours, the sending of incompetent agents may irreparably damage the Church's work in heathen lands, and those who have to administer missionary affairs at home are often sorely distracted between the urgency of the demand for men and the inadequacy of the supply.

The primary essential in a missionary, male or female, is vocation. On this point the testimony of all sections of the Church, as represented at the Conference, was absolutely unanimous. But it needs no little acumen in the 'discerning of spirits' to determine whether an asserted vocation in each individual case is genuine, and the question is one which, amidst the mixed motives that sway human action, is more easily asked than answered. The desire to attain a higher social status or to secure a livelihood, the craving for the notoriety which attaches to foreign mission work, or for the excitement attendant on travel in unknown lands, the enthusiasm kindled at some stirring meeting which may be genuine and permanent, or may prove temporary and evanescent—all these mingled inducements may influence men and women to offer themselves who yet lack the one fundamental requisite, and the result may be painful and inevitable failure.

'Soon after the novelty of their new surroundings has passed off they begin to grow weary of the sameness and isolation of their new life, the indifference or perhaps the opposition they meet with, their want of success in the present and the little hope (as they think) of better things in the future.'<sup>1</sup>

To all such failures the surest antidote—as was well insisted upon by men of such diverse schools of thought as Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews and Mr. Webb-Peploe, by Father Page and Mr. Webster—the surest antidote is a faithful adherence to the doctrine of vocation. Only because God calls should anyone venture on so arduous a work, and only in full assurance that the call is from Him will the grace of complete self-surrender and self-sacrifice be vouchsafed. Nothing can be

<sup>1</sup> Father Page, Superior of the Society of St. John's, Cowley, p. 25.

more disastrous to the successful advocacy of mission claims at home as well as to substantial and lasting mission work abroad than the introduction into it of persons who lack this indispensable *feu sacré*, and where this primary gift has been, so far as can be judged, in any case bestowed, a careful training is further requisite to develop other necessary qualities, spiritual, intellectual, and physical.

'When characters poor and uncultivated,' says Chancellor Worledge, 'come into contact with finer work than they can really grasp, their deficiencies become painfully apparent. Many of them have no real discipline and inherit no traditions, whether of family or of place of education. This is what is overlooked by those who advocate the admission of men of humble origin, *indiscriminately*, for the position of a missionary priest.'<sup>1</sup>

We may glance presently at some of the special dangers to which missionaries are exposed in the prosecution of their work, but enough has been said to justify the high standard alike of education and character which all the most experienced members of the Colonial and Missionary Episcopate demand. 'We require among our Zulus,' said the late Bishop of Zululand, 'almost better men than you employ in England.' No doubt the actual will, here as elsewhere, alas! only too frequently fall short of the ideal. No doubt a percentage of mistakes will be made, and form the subject of sarcastic comment from those whose own self-indulgence allows them with an easy conscience to evade every call upon them to help in the extension of Christ's kingdom. No doubt occasionally some ludicrous example of misapprehension of the true missionary standpoint may be quoted, as in the instance named by Dr. Cust of a lady who asked for increase of her stipend from the society which employed her because she wanted to give more away *in charity*—at the society's expense, of course. Yet we see no reason for discouragement if the Church only awakens to a clear comprehension of her responsibility and of the material at hand for discharging it. The greater interest now awakened in missions is simultaneous with the rapid advance of education, and as the high spiritual privilege of serving in the mission field at home or abroad is more generally realized we are justified in believing that, in answer to fervent intercession, He who has so ordered all things as to create the opportunity will move the hearts of the faithful to employ it to His glory.

We must refer our readers for detailed suggestions on the

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Dr. Maclear, p. 40 *note*.

preparation of missionaries to the papers on Methods of Training read at the Conference, and amongst these we would specially commend those by Dr. Maclear, the Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and Rev. W. J. Oldfield, Principal of St. Paul's Missionary College, Burgh. The following condensed extracts from Mr. Oldfield's paper are, we think, at once pregnant and practical. The average missionary student, he remarks,

'can give you dates and facts in Church history; he knows something of its literature; but it has never occurred to him to look out for and follow up the gradual evolution of the workings of Divine Providence, the good hand of God ever present in the changes in the history of nations that have affected or gone to make up the Church of God. Even in his Bible knowledge he knows more about the various readings, the disputed authorships, the time of compilation, and the age of manuscripts than he does about the guiding hand of God upon it all, though that teaching lies upon the surface in the Old Testament and is gathered ready to his hand in the New Testament. What is the result? He goes out to the mission full of zeal and hope, but not realising how God slowly prepares each step before entering upon a new one; he takes the work, if we may reverently say so, out of God's hands, transplants his English ideas wholesale in every soil, forces them to an unnatural growth, and satisfies his hungry supporters at home with statistics of converts, catechumens, and communicants. And then, if after a time he has to endure a number of grievous losses, he either sinks into a routine of comparative indifference or breaks down in despair.'

Then, after enumerating some of the difficulties against which missionary colleges have to contend, and which are mainly due to the impatience of their supporters for rapid and immediate results, he proceeds to describe how sadly the missionary student is hampered by lack of time for adequate study of the history of missions, a subject which with him ought to come next to that of Holy Scripture.

'He has of course heard of Bishop Patteson, and knows that he met a martyr's death, but he has not been taught to study his methods: methods which, without some indications for study, will be regarded as too slow by modern youthful zeal. We are not content in these days to do only the sowing; we want also the watering and the reaping of the increase. He has heard, perhaps, of Bishop Gray, and knows that he had a quarrel with somebody or other; but he does not see how, by brave endurance, he founded the South African Church, and gave it that sure position which has enabled it since to extend itself so rapidly and successfully. He has heard of Bishop Steere, but he does not see how he, and Mr. Madan after him, have, by dry, uninteresting labours, made it possible for Englishmen to enter into the thoughts and feelings of the people;

to whom they are sent, and so enabled Bishop Smythies to give full effect to his saintly zeal and establish a sure Church, which will hold his name in reverence for ever.'

And the consequences of this defective training are manifested in the young missionary's standpoint and tone on his arrival in the field of labour, upon which he enters with a certain self-conscious and self-willed zeal, instead of the chastened temper which says—

'I go out simply as Christ's servant. I will seek the guidance of His will written in the past history of missions: I will seek it in the climate, in the surroundings, in the character and habits of the people to whom I am sent; I will seek it in their rulers; I will seek it written in the destiny of my country now working out in all its responsibilities under Divine guidance, and using me as one humble instrument towards its ultimate fulfilment. I will ask for no immediate results; I will be content if I can lay a sure foundation on which those who come after me may build' (pp. 46, 48).

Discussion on the several systems of non-Christian religions, and the problems which they involve, was inevitably of a somewhat fragmentary character. There are few harder tasks presented to a conscientious student than the mastery of the great systems of Hinduism and Buddhism, and even those who have studied them most deeply confess that they have failed to understand them in all their bearings. But what a change has come over the missionary mind from the days when all these elaborate systems, which have captivated, and in some degree satisfied so many thousands of millions, were imperiously swept aside by the Christian teacher as worthless lumber! What altered views are entertained of the equipment with which the champions of the Cross should enter the lists against non-Christian religions! How different the bearing and deportment now held to become the teacher who would win over the instructed mind to the obedience of faith! With that strange tendency to reaction which so commonly forms the retribution of ignorant disdain, there is danger now lest an excessive value should be assigned to the half-truths and imperfect morality of non-Christian religions, and lest a Christian meaning should be imported into words which in their heathen usage had a far lower signification. How unexpected again, to many conceptions of them, is the fact that in Hinduism and the creed of Islam, Christianity has to contend not with inert masses, but has to enter into competition with an earnest, living propaganda; that each of these faiths is winning over large bodies of adherents at the present hour, and that, in the face of ten thousand open Bibles

and a wide diffusive acquaintance with their teaching, there are reformed Hindus who proudly affirm that the highest development of religion and the creed of the future will be theirs and not Christ's. With practical unanimity three points were insisted on as essential to proper dealing with those who are still outside the pale of Christianity. First, an adequate grasp of the religion, Hindu, Buddhist, or Mohammedan, from which the missionary aims at making converts. Second, so entire a sympathy with non-Christian people as to be able, on the one hand, to recognize frankly whatever is good and true in their systems, and on the other hand to realize the stupendous social obstacles which oppose their public profession of Christianity. Third, so clear a conviction that Christianity is God's one appointed way of salvation as may prevent their energy from being even unconsciously undermined by undue appreciation of any other creed however specious or attractive.

No problem arising out of mission work presents such apparently insuperable difficulties as the struggle between Christianity and Islam, and at times the prospect has appeared so hopeless that faint-hearted Christians have proposed to abandon certain parts of the world to the faith of the false prophet, as better suited to the temperament of their peoples, and to concentrate all Christian effort on more promising regions. To all such proposals we have but one answer, whose scope and authority are alike illimitable. 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature,' is the Divine command, and woe be to us if we venture in any degree to restrict its application. To English Churchmen the interest engendered by the inherent difficulty of the task is enhanced by the fact that our Empress Queen rules over more Mohammedan subjects than the Kalif himself; that the creed of Mohammed reigns supreme over the lands of the Bible, the cradle of the human race, and of the great ancient world empires; and that we are brought into contact or conflict with its desolating influence at countless points on the continents and islands of Africa and Asia. Whatever virtues may fairly be claimed for the creed or the practice of the Moslems, one fact stands out in lurid perspicacity despite all the earnest pleading of their apologists. There is no Mohammedan land which is not a desert, and there is no Christian land that is. A curse appears to make a fruitful land barren where Islam bears sway, whereas under Christian rule the wilderness is glad and the desert rejoices and blossoms as the rose.

In dealing with a task of such stupendous magnitude, the  
VOL. XXXIX.—NO. LXXVIII. F F

first necessity is to form some adequate conception of its character, and to this the papers and discussions at the Conference contributed much that was exceptionally valuable. In the hands of Sir Frederick Goldsmid and Dr. Bruce, of Mr. Bosworth Smith, Mr. Foster, and others, the question was treated with fulness both of knowledge and of practical experience. One or more salient points may serve to illustrate the position at the present moment, and have, perhaps, been hardly grasped in all their meaning, even by those who are not unacquainted with mission problems. Our first quotation is from Dr. Bruce, who has spent, we believe, a quarter of a century in Persia.

'As a mission field,' he writes, 'the lands of the Bible are unique and differ from all other mission fields. Islam is the Goliath of all the religions of the heathen, the only one which appears, *in its stronghold at least*, to defy the armies of the living God. In India a large proportion of our very best native Christian workers are converts from Islam. In almost all other mission fields Churches have been gathered out from the heathen, and nuclei of light have been kindled in the midst of the surrounding darkness of heathendom; but from the western frontier of Egypt to the western frontier of India, no Churches composed of converts from Islam have as yet been founded. Islam in its native land seems still to be invulnerable as ever' (p. 80).

Nor is it merely that having developed or absorbed one distinguishing characteristic of the unchanging East, Islam presents a stolid, unbroken front in its cradle to all the assaults of aggressive Christianity. It is with no mere *vis inertiae* that it is content calmly to hold its ground. If the path of its advance be no longer red with streams of Christian blood nor glittering with the flash of sword and spear, Islam is still a proselytizing and conquering creed; in all probability the most triumphant and advancing of living creeds at the present hour. We wonder how many English Christians realize the astounding fact that the followers of Mohammed press their missions with a volume, a zeal, and a devotion worthy of the highest and holiest of causes. To very many we are persuaded Mr. Scarth's account of the great Moslem missionary colleges in Egypt would come as a startling revelation.

'There is,' he said, 'a very large college in Cairo. It numbers 10,000 scholars and has 325 professors. All the students are free students, and there is nothing paid to any of the professors but the chief. It is from that centre that the power of the Mohammedan religion goes everywhere into all the world, but especially into Africa, because out of the 10,000 students at that college, there were, not



long since, nearly 1,000 from Upper Egypt and the Soudan. From the records that we have of the college, we find that their system is a very good one. They bring people from the different countries—not all Mohammedan countries—they bring natives who can speak the languages, and gather them together in this special college in Cairo, at the mosque El-Azhar, and there they instruct them in the Mohammedan religion very strictly. They teach four books generally beside the Koran, and every student has to learn each one of these books by heart and to know something of Arabic. He goes back to his country as a missionary to see what he can do. These men go back to the Soudan and Central Africa to encourage and keep up that Mohammedan religion which fosters and brings about the slave trade. There is no doubt that if we find the real difficulty we may be able to overcome it by good Christian work in Egypt, notwithstanding the nightly prayer at El-Azhar for the destruction of all Christians. . . . But we have scarcely a missionary in Egypt! With this college sending out, perhaps, 3,000 men a year to the different parts of the Mohammedan field, it seems to be almost ridiculous that we should speak of our missionary effort in Egypt, when we only have three or four clergymen there. One of the troubles which we have in Egypt is this, that the Government, who have something to do with the protectorate of Egypt, tell us very little of what they do in the protecting. But if they protect this college of El-Azhar, as in duty bound, and another great college in the oasis of Siwa, of which they know very little indeed, and which is about sixteen days' journey from Cairo, there is a great deal to be considered and a great deal to be done in trying, while we have influence in Egypt, to modify the influence of these vast powers in their efforts to support slavery and to keep back Christianity' (pp. 247-8).

It would overpass the limits of our space to enter upon the reasons which explain the earlier successes of Islam and account for its present vitality. Amongst these are not only its appeal to the animal passions, its promise of a paradise of sensual delight, its accordance with the martial spirit of savage or semi-civilized races, its tolerance of polygamy and slavery, there are deeper grounds than these for the early spread of Mohammedanism and for its revival at the present time. Amongst the foremost of these is the past and present degradation of the Eastern Churches, in which Mariolatry had risen to such a pitch, that the Christian Trinity was supposed to consist of the Father, the ever-blessed Virgin and her Son; whilst prevalent image-worship gave force to the watchword of Mohammed against idolatry and his assertion of the unity of the Godhead. A second reason is to be found in the impassioned fanaticism of the Moslem emissary whose ascetic self-devotion, like that of the Hindu fakir, makes a deep impression on the Eastern imagination, and places the calmer

methods of the Christian missionary in disadvantageous contrast. A third, and probably yet more efficient as well as more lamentable cause is found in the difference of the treatment experienced by converts to Islam and Christianity.

'A convert to Islam,' said Mr. Foster, 'becomes the member of a mighty religious and political brotherhood, he is honoured and treated as an equal, and he can occupy the highest office in the State. How different is his reception into Christianity. He is never welcomed as an equal, his position must always be an inferior one, he is not admitted into social intercourse with his white fellow-Christians, and often he is treated with condescending pity. African converts do not want mere sentimental pity, for they feel how it reduces their character to hypocrisy and self-distrust, destroying all their individuality. We must not forget that while Islam won its first converts by the sword, yet it holds them in subjection by sympathy' (p. 246).

Every discussion of Indian problems will naturally include the vexed question of caste—the bane and the bugbear of the South Indian Churches. If it be strange that so ruthless a division of humanity should ever have obtained very general acceptance throughout India, it is no less strange that its influence should be so subtle and pervasive, and that it should reappear again amongst professed Christians, to the trouble and distraction of the native Church—stranger still that Europeans should palliate and uphold its recognition. At times its power breaks out with a renewed force, which seems ineradicable and might tempt men to despair. In this matter as in others of missionary perplexity, the native Church suffers from the intricate entanglements of Church and State in India. It needs the presence and authority of a bishop, clothed with full canonical power and yet in constant touch with the native mind, to settle and enforce Church discipline. Who can doubt that if the Anglican communion had placed a bishop over Tinnevely—not as an assistant to the see of Madras, but with the independent standing of a separate diocese—many of the evils which we have had to deplore would have been spared us? We cannot enter upon an explanation here of the obstacles that have hitherto prevented so natural a remedy which, though still delayed, will shortly, we trust, be provided.

It is possible, however, to misinterpret the persistence of caste-separation, if we fail to realize that caste is not only a religious but also a social distinction. Within a church's hallowed walls, where there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, there must be no recognition of caste—no, not

for an hour. It is high time that some authoritative Church canon settled that question decisively and finally. But in merely social matters we agree with the contention of Dr. Cust and others that we should not require of high-caste converts a renunciation of those social distinctions which prevail amongst all highly-civilized communities. Caste implies difference of race, of occupation, of acquired hereditary habits, of education, of social standing. Do we urge in such test-cases as marriage supplies a disregard of these social barriers at home? Then why should we insist on it in India? There is yet another element in the influence of caste which cannot safely be disregarded :

‘There are innumerable advantages,’ it was remarked, ‘from the caste system to those who belong to it. Any moral offence, such as the taking away of a daughter from a man’s family by a youth of the same caste, is punished by his whole brotherhood. The discipline of the caste exerted for moral and social purposes is wonderfully perfect, and one that we must be most careful that by no hasty influences from our English Government we too hurriedly break up. As Mr. Herbert Spencer has told us with regard to ethics, it is a most terrible thing when you change the social and ethical system of a people by force or by hasty means.’<sup>1</sup>

An interesting discussion upon the ‘Undue Introduction of Western Ways’ occupied a section of the Mission Conference. Amongst the dangers to which the missionary is exposed in his dealing with savage races, not the least is the excessive adulation of converts to whom the simplest gifts of Western civilization appear miraculous. Hence arises the temptation to assume undue ascendancy on the one side, and to follow Western ways too slavishly on the other. Spiritual and secular pride besets the teacher, and hollow pretentiousness the taught. The proper task of the missionary is to infuse Christianity into the national life, that it shall become sweet and simple according to the natural bias and present development of those who receive it, not that it shall alter that life’s whole framework after some Western pattern. It requires keen sympathy with the highest welfare of the native converts, joined to sound discretion in the selection of native assistants in ministerial labour, so to build up an infant Church as to avoid keeping it too long in swaddling clothes and launching it prematurely on a career of independence. English missionaries ought to aim, not at a reproduction under very different surroundings from ourselves of many servile copies of our Anglican forms of

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference, &c.*, p. 208.

worship, but at so perfect an instruction of their flocks in the fundamental truths of the Christian faith as may insure the retention of all essentials of order and worship in Churches developed according to the genius of each kingdom and people. We deem this point to be of such importance, that we shall ask leave to quote at some length Lord Stanmore's striking contrast of two southern villages: one thoroughly denationalized by Westernism, the other conducted on more rational principles:

'The visitor to the first,' he writes, 'would find, on emerging from the woods, a bare cleared space, unrelieved by a single tree. Here, under the full glare of the sun, stand rows of wooden-frame huts, at some distance from each other, and so arranged as to form a species of street. In the centre of the village is the cricket-field, a desolate expanse of dry earth, on one side of which is the church, a wooden, barn-like building. If entered, it will be found filled with crazy benches; beyond them rises a huge octagonal pulpit, in which, if the day be Sunday, we shall find the native minister arrayed in a greenish-black swallow-tail coat, a neckcloth, once white, and a pair of spectacles, which he probably does not need, preaching to a congregation the male portion of which is dressed in much the same manner as himself, while the women are dizenod out in old battered hats or bonnets and shapeless gowns like bathing-dresses, or it may be crinolines of an early type.'

We cannot transfer to our pages the entire picture of tawdry finery and discomfort, the lack of spontaneous enjoyment and the air of sullen discontent; but the latter part of the description is too serious and suggestive to be omitted:

'The inhabitants,' his lordship continues, 'have good ground for their dissatisfaction. At the time when I visited the villages I have especially in my eye, it was punishable by fine and imprisonment to wear native clothing; punishable by fine and imprisonment to make native cloth; punishable by fine and imprisonment to smoke tobacco; punishable by fine and imprisonment to make or drink the native beverage, kava; punishable by fine and imprisonment to wear long hair or a garland of flowers; punishable by fine and imprisonment to wrestle or to play at ball; punishable by fine and imprisonment to build a native-fashioned house; punishable not to wear shirt and trowsers, and in certain localities coats and shoes also; and in addition to laws enforcing a strictly puritanical observation of the Sabbath, it was forbidden to bathe on Sundays. In some other places bathing on Sunday was punishable by flogging; and to my knowledge women have been flogged for no other offence, by order of a native teacher, whose action was by no means so decidedly disapproved by his white superior as it should have been. Men in such circumstances are ripe for revolt, and sometimes it comes.'

Such procedure would be incredible were it asserted on less indisputable authority ; but Lord Stanmore insisted that he was not quoting from a solitary case, but that he had met with many such instances, not only in the South Seas, but both in Ceylon and New Zealand. We turn for relief to a village in a mission conducted on different principles :

‘ In such a village,’ he says, ‘ there would be no attempt to mimic a backwood settlement ; the houses, built of bamboo and reeds and covered with thatch, are irregularly placed under the shade of cocoanut, bread-fruit and other trees, and usually surrounded by a fence or live hedge. The visitor who enters will find no chairs, but a profusion of mats which increase in fineness from the entrance to the dais at the upper end . . . The aspect of the people is wholly different from that of the inhabitants of the village previously described. They have an air of alertness and independence. Laughter and shouting are heard among them. Here the course of life is natural and unself-conscious, but it is not the less pervaded by Christianity. There is not a house in which family prayer is not daily said, and on Sundays we shall find the church, itself a large native house, filled with an attentive congregation. Here, however, we find no battered, sham finery ; the people, seated cross-legged, or prostrate with their heads and breasts upon the mats, remind one of the worshippers of a Mohammedan mosque rather than of a Christian Church.’<sup>1</sup>

Under the somewhat vague heading of ‘ Educational Missions,’ attention was almost exclusively directed to the higher education in India. With intelligible but mistaken jealousy of large expenditure for any save directly evangelistic efforts, objection has been taken to the amount spent by the societies on secondary and university education ; as if funds which were designed for the spread of the Gospel were being diverted to secular uses. But whilst no one would affirm education to be absolutely the best form of missionary effort, there is ample evidence that it is not only the best mode of reaching the higher classes, but also that it is essentially necessary for the advancement of converts from the lower castes. The consensus of weighty testimony, not only from Indian bishops and experienced missionaries, but from statesmen of eminence, in favour of educational missions is overwhelming. Lord Northbrook, Sir Charles Trevelyan, Sir William Muir, Sir Charles Aitchison, are only examples of more recent witnesses from a line which extends from the days of the Marquis Wellesley down to the present hour. On the occasion of a visit to the Madras Christian College only last year the Hon. Mr. A. T. Arundel said : ‘ I can testify to

<sup>1</sup> *Report of Missionary Conference, &c.*, pp. 327-9.

the enormous advance that has been made in the moral tone of the public service. I have put into it many graduates, some from this college, with great advantage to it, both in efficiency and in tone'; and this advance is largely due to the Missionary schools and colleges, whose influence is making itself felt throughout the length and breadth of India. The bonds of traditional custom are being loosened, the iron fetters even of caste are being relaxed by priests and pundits, in their anxiety to meet awakened minds half-way, and to prevent an open avowal of Christianity; the absurdities of Hindu mythology are hiding themselves from the exposure which the light of science renders intolerable, and all the ingenuity of men who have abandoned their ancestral faith but have not accepted Christianity, is being exerted, as it was in the first centuries of the Christian Church, in devising compromises which may comprehend (as they imagine) the best features of the old faith and the new. It is most instructive to mark how the experience of earlier ages—not many mighty, not many noble—is being repeated now; how the phases through which Corinth and Rome passed are being renewed at Calcutta and Benares; how the readiness to receive the Gospel manifested by the barbarians, and the sullen aloofness of their Roman masters, finds its counterpart in the contrasted attitude of pariah and Brahmin to the doctrine of the Cross; how even the singular appearance of Neo-Platonism has its parallel in the Brahmo Somaj and in the Aryan Somaj, now preached in British India.

We have reached the limits of our space, and are constrained to leave untouched many other topics to which we would gladly have directed the attention of our readers. The comparative value and efficiency of Associate Missions and family life deserves an entire paper to itself, and would teem with interest in hands which would pourtray the splendid work of the several university missions at Calcutta, Delhi, and Cawnpore. No less space might well be claimed for medical and zenana work, each of them a comparatively recent development, capable of indefinite extension, and calculated to reach those who had been hitherto beyond the pale of ordinary mission influence. The creation of a Christian vernacular literature in many scores of languages, starting from a version of the Bible or New Testament—the frequent nucleus around which a native literature gathers—and extending to Prayer Book and Church Hymnal, opens a field of fascinating inquiry, and we would commend especially the papers read in this section to those who care to realize its



advantages and its pitfalls. Other subjects still press on our attention—last, yet by no means least—Church organization and discipline, native agencies and episcopate, so full of peril, so absolutely indispensable to vigorous Church growth.

To those who are disposed to think that Mission work is occupying too large a share of the Church's time and energy, we would commend the latter portion of Bishop Westcott's very striking Preface to the *Reports of the Boards of Missions*. Much as has already been accomplished, so very much more still remains to be done, that we have as yet only touched the edge of the mission field. As yet only a third of our parochial congregations contribute to the mission cause, and the offerings of the wealthier classes—with a few bright exceptions—for mission objects fall strangely below the standard of their gifts for works of piety at home. As yet the urgency and the grandeur of mission work has not largely fired the imagination of the younger men amongst us. They do not realize what a field of enterprise, adventure, and endeavour it opens out; 'what scope for every natural endowment and Divine grace; for patience, for sympathy, for wisdom, for Christian statesmanship.' As yet we have not learned as a corporate Church—the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the greatest colonizing people in the world—to recognize that we are called on as is no other Church and nation, through missions, to win fresh lands for Christ. But the work is one which will bring with its larger accomplishment a very special blessing. We may find in the mission field a much-needed spiritual unity when every variety of temperament and service is seen to be hallowed to one end. We may find a much-needed assurance of the working and presence of spiritual power when even the weak agency already employed is proved effectual to the pulling down of ancient and time-honoured strongholds. We may find a practical answer to many speculative doubts, and a harvest of fuller knowledge of God's purposes and their fulfilment before our eyes. Nor is it too much to hope, with the writer whose words we have already more than once quoted, that

'If we welcome in the Divine voice addressed to us in the records of our national life—*'Ye shall be my witnesses . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth'*—our anxious questionings, our disastrous jealousies and divisions, our perilous debates on unfathomable truths, will be brought into subjection to the overmastering love which flows from the Cross of Christ.'—*Board of Missions Reports*, p. 11.

## ART. VIII.—DALE'S 'CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.'

*Christian Doctrine.* A Series of Discourses. By R. W. DALE, LL.D. (London, 1894.)

THE general character of this very interesting book is indicated by the preface. Dr. Dale there mentions the practice of preaching 'doctrinal sermons' with which he began his ministry, gives a specimen of the lists of subjects which it has been his custom to draw up 'in December or January' for use 'during the following twelve months,' in order 'to avoid the danger of failing to give to any of the great doctrines of the Christian Faith an adequate place in' his 'preaching,' and adds that, nevertheless, the sermons 'collected in this volume,' which were 'delivered during the last twelve months,' formed his first attempt at 'a series of discourses expounding, in an orderly and systematic manner, all the principal doctrines of the Christian Faith' (Preface, pp. v-vii).

It is interesting to observe the contents of the specimen list of subjects which was among the precursors of the present more fully developed series, and to notice Dr. Dale's experience as to the interest of congregations in 'doctrinal sermons.' The list to which he refers 'includes the following topics: the Incarnation; the Divinity of Christ; the Personality of the Spirit; the Trinity; Sin; the Atonement; Faith; Justification; Life in Christ; Regeneration; Sanctification; Judgment to come;' and 'on Great Christian Duties' 'the following subjects: Truth; Justice; Magnanimity; Industry; Temperance; Endurance; Public Spirit; Courage; Contentment.' The result of his experience is that 'doctrinal sermons,' 'if of moderate length,' 'are of great interest to large numbers of Christian people' (Preface, pp. vi, vii).

If this book served no other purpose than to call attention to the need of systematic instruction from the pulpit on matters of faith and morals, thoughtful persons might well welcome it for that alone. The value of clear and systematic preaching on Christian doctrine and Christian duties can hardly be exaggerated. It is sad to think of the time and strength that are wasted and the opportunities that are lost because of the too common practice of the clergy of preaching sermons which are without any really definite aim, and in which there is no ordered sequence of thought. And there can be little doubt that many congregations would give to

well-planned and carefully executed courses of doctrinal and ethical sermons a degree of attention which they do not think it worth while to bestow on desultory and fragmentary discourses.

But the value of Dr. Dale's volume is not to be estimated simply by the fact that it calls attention to a prevalent need. It is to be expected that the theological standpoint and the standard of religious authority of an eminent Congregationalist should be markedly different from our own; but, while this difference exists—and certainly must not be minimized—it is cheering to observe, in a book like the subject of this review, the amount of common ground. The sermons contain admirable teaching about some of the arguments which bear on the existence of God. Some aspects of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity are urged with much force. The statements on the historical growth of the expression of this doctrine contrast most favourably with much which has been elsewhere written. The doctrine was not 'reached' 'by any process of philosophical speculation on the nature of God.' The 'belief,' 'implicated in' the 'very life' of 'the Church,' that 'Christ is a Divine Person,' and that 'the Spirit is a Divine Person,' necessarily led, if 'the unity of God' was to be maintained, to 'the doctrine of the Trinity.' 'The doctrine is an attempt to assert the divine unity, while asserting the divinity of the Son and of the Spirit' (p. 153; compare the note on pp. 320-2). The true Godhead and perfect Manhood of Christ, the Personality and Divine Being of the Holy Spirit, the fact of the dominion of sin in the world, the need of redemption, the reality of atonement, the general trustworthiness of Holy Scripture, are carefully taught, and in some cases are treated with striking power. If, in some points, we are about to criticize what Dr. Dale says, we do not fail to recognize the value of very much with which we cordially agree.

At the present time the doctrine of the Incarnation is attracting widespread attention from Christians and from non-Christians. Various circumstances have combined to make it prominent. The insistence upon it as a theological truth and a moral force by teachers whose words command consideration; attacks which openly deny it or try to rob it of its meaning by comparisons with beliefs in heathen systems; theories of how much or how little it necessarily involves; earnest faith and questioning scepticism, have all had something to do with the interest which is excited by any mention of the doctrine. Those who have realized Dr. Dale's powers

as a theologian will be anxious to know what he has to say on this subject.

The two sermons on 'The Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ' cover, for the most part, well-known ground, but they present familiar arguments in a method and with a force which make them fresh; and Dr. Dale is expressing truth which needs to be emphasized when he points out that there is no real 'return to Christ' in a more vivid knowledge of the facts and surroundings of His human life unless it is associated with a stronger grasp upon His Deity, and that

'the real wonder and power of our Lord's earthly life remain unknown until His Divinity becomes as real to us as His humanity, and we see in Him the glory of the Eternal' (p. 102).

This recognition of the supreme value of the doctrine of Christ's Godhead does not in these sermons impair the teaching of His Manhood, and there is a very full statement on this subject in the third sermon.

In the interest in the doctrine of the Incarnation, to which we have already alluded as having been quickened of late years, the question of the relation of our Lord's two natures to one another, partly because of its intrinsic importance, and partly because of its bearing on controversies of the day, has held a prominent place. There is much which bears on this question in the sermons themselves and in the notes. Dr. Dale is careful to show that he does not accept the 'kenotic' theory which is now popular, and in a valuable note he says with regard to it—

'The traditional theory of the Christian Church is, not that the Eternal Son of God, when He became Man, parted with His divine consciousness and ceased to exercise His divine powers, but that He added the consciousness and experience of a really human life, with all its limitations, to His eternal consciousness of blessedness and glory. The same Personality was the centre of two natures, the divine and the human; exerted two parallel activities, did not cease to act as God, but began also to act as Man; was conscious of two parallel experiences, of divine blessedness and of human sorrow, weariness, and pain. He was God and remained God; but He became Man. This, I say, as contrasted with the doctrine of the *Kenosis*, is the traditional belief of the Christian Church. . . .

'The whole subject is profoundly mysterious; but, while we must reverently acknowledge that we are unable to comprehend it, we may without irreverence criticize any human explanation of it. What, then, it may be asked, on the theory of the *Kenosis*, became of those divine powers and qualities which the Eternal Son of God renounced, laid aside, when He became incarnate? Did they cease to be during the three-and-thirty years of His earthly life? Did they

once more begin to be when that earthly life was ended? Or, if they continued to be, during the interval, how is it conceivable that powers and qualities could exist apart from the Person to whom they belonged? . . . The powers by which from age to age He sustains and holds together the whole creation were still exerted while He "dwelt among us," or the creation would have sunk back into chaos. Can we conceive that His "powers" were still active when they had ceased to be His? Or, if they were still active, can we conceive that He was unconscious of their activity?

'There are other objections to the theory. It affirms that the divine and personal centre of our Lord's life had renounced all divine qualities and powers; its whole manifestation, therefore, was human. But while our Lord was truly Man, was there not something unique in His perfection? Was His perfection nothing more than a high degree of human saintliness? While the *forms* under which He thought and felt and acted were human, was there not something in their *contents* which transcended humanity? . . . His knowledge of the Father was something different in kind from that which comes to a saint through the illumination of the Holy Spirit; the knowledge was human in its intellectual forms, but it was drawn, as the knowledge of saints is not drawn, from a consciousness which appears to have had some share in the very life and thought of the Father. . . . He was divine in the centre of His life, and He knew that He was divine; He was conscious of sharing the life of God' (pp. 310-12).

It will be observed that in this criticism Dr. Dale has chiefly in view extreme forms of the theory of the 'Kenosis.' This is indicated by the statement, 'It affirms that the divine and personal centre of our Lord's life had renounced all divine qualities and powers.' But his objections to the theory apply to all forms which include what he specifies as the essential point in it—namely, that they represent 'the Divine Ego of the Son—the I—as renouncing, when He became incarnate, not only the exercise but the possession of the Divine attributes' (pp. 309, 310). Such representations of the act of the Eternal Word in becoming Man cannot be too often or too clearly repudiated. They are contrary to the true sense of the passages in the New Testament by which it has been attempted to support them.<sup>1</sup> They are plainly contradictory

<sup>1</sup> Phil. ii. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 9. Both these passages mean that the Word added to His Divine Being the humiliation of a human life. In Phil. ii. 7 the meaning of the phrase *εαυτὸν ἐκένωσε* is supplied by the following words: *μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*, as the meaning of *ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν* in verse 8 is supplied by *γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου*, and the passage affords no support whatever to a theory that the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* was surrendered. See Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, Article ii., 'If any man doubt how Christ emptied Himself the text will satisfy him, by "taking the form of a servant;" if any still question how He took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostle's resolution, by "being made in

to the general stream of patristic doctrine.<sup>1</sup> They cannot really be defended by a reference to an expression in Hilary of Poitiers,<sup>2</sup> or to one side of the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>3</sup> By representing the Incarnation as a surrender of what is Divine, instead of an acquiring of what is human, they imperil the truth of the immutability of the essential Being of God, and rob the Atonement of its significance and power.<sup>4</sup>

We have said that the objections to the theory of the 'Kenosis' apply to all forms of it which represent the Son of God as surrendering the possession of His Divine attributes. There is no ground whatever for a distinction whereby it may be said that, while He must of necessity retain His moral attributes, He can and did abandon His attributes of knowledge and power. It is convenient in thought and in doctrinal systems to distinguish between the Nature of God and the attributes which belong to the Divine Being, and further between different groups of these attributes. But when such distinctions are made it must always be remembered that the attributes of the Godhead are as necessarily connected with its Essence as are the relative attributes which denote Personality with the Person to whom they belong. We can no

the likeness of men." . . . As, therefore, His humiliation consisted in His obedience unto death, so His exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man.' The other passage, 2 Cor. viii. 9, is admirably explained by St. Athanasius, *C. Apoll.* ii. 11, πῶς δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ χεῦσεν ὁ Θεός; οὐτὴν πτωχεύσαν φύσιν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀνελάβετο. Compare St. Augustine, *Sermo* xiv. 7: 'Paupertatem cogitemus, ne forte pauperes vel ipsam capiamus. Concipitur utero feminae virginali, includitur visceribus matris. O paupertas! In angusto diversorio nascitur, involutus infantilibus tegumentis in præsepio ponitur, fit cibaria jumentis pauperibus; deinde cæli et terræ Dominus, creator Angelorum, omnium visibilium et invisibilium effector et conditor sugit, vagit, nutritur, crescit, tolerat ætatem, occultat majestatem; postea tenetur, contemnitur, flagellatur, illuditur, conspuitur, colaphizatur, spinis coronatur, ligno suspenditur, lancea perforatur.'

<sup>1</sup> The general teaching of the Fathers is represented by such passages as St. Athanasius, *De Incarn.* xvii., οὐδὲ τῆς Παρθένου τρυφῆς ἐπάσχειν αὐτὸς, and St. Leo, *Ep.* xxviii. 3, 'Humana augens, divina non minuens: quia exinanitio illa . . . inclinatio fuit miserationis, non defectio potestatis.'

<sup>2</sup> Both St. Hilary's general teaching and the context in *De Trin.* ix. 14 make it clear that by 'evacuatio formæ' he does not mean the surrender of any Divine attribute: compare Bright, *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, p. 275, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> That St. Cyril of Alexandria did not by the κένωσις mean that the Son of God in becoming incarnate surrendered anything that was Divine has lately been shown with great clearness and force; see Bright, *Waymarks in Church History*, pp. 384-93.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Newman, *Parochial Sermons*, vol. vi., Sermons 5, 6.



more say that any Person can part with the attributes which characterize Godhead than we can say that the Son can cease to be begotten, or the Spirit to proceed. In the terse Latin of the unfinished masterpiece of the great Bishop Pearson—

'Si essentia esset realiter distincta ab attributis, distingueretur realiter a perfectionibus suis; attributa enim divina sunt perfectiones Dei: at si essentia realiter distingueretur a perfectionibus divinis, tum essentia Dei non esset realiter perfecta, et Deus ipse, cujus est essentia, non esset essentialiter perfectus.'<sup>1</sup>

'Si essentia divina distingueretur realiter ab attributis, Deus non esset unus, sed multa; non simplex, sed compositus. At nulla compositio aut multiplicitas potest consistere cum perfectione divina, ut postea probabimus et nunc apparet; quia omnis perfectio in identitatem collecta perfectior est earundem perfectionum multiplici-  
tate.'<sup>2</sup>

Or, if it is the knowledge of God, the supposed surrender of which is in view, we may quote the words of the same profound theologian:

'Scientia Dei est infinita, immutabilis, æterna. Probatur; quia infinitudo, immutabilitas, et æternitas sunt attributa divina. Omnia autem attributa divina conveniunt essentiæ Dei. Ipsa autem scientia Dei est ipsa essentia divina. Ergo ei competunt infinitudo, immutabilitas, et æternitas.'<sup>3</sup>

While we thus most cordially agree with Dr. Dale's emphatic repudiation of 'the doctrine of the Kenosis,' we are of opinion that he exaggerates the limitations of our Lord's Manhood. There was, indeed, in the Incarnation the most wonderful restraint of power. The Son of God willed that in His human life He should depend on food, on rest, on sleep. He

<sup>1</sup> Pearson, *Lectioes de Deo et attributis*, Lectio iv. (ed. Churton, t. i. p. 39): 'If the essence were *realiter* distinct from the attributes, it would be *realiter* distinguished from its own perfections, for the Divine attributes are the perfections of God. But if the essence were *realiter* distinguished from the Divine perfections, then the essence of God would not be *realiter* perfect, and God Himself, of whom it is the essence, would not be *essentialiter* perfect.'

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 39, 40: 'If the Divine essence were *realiter* distinguished from the attributes, God would not be one, but many; not simple, but compounded. But no compounding or multiplicity can exist together with the Divine perfection, as we shall afterwards prove and as is now clear, because all perfection, when gathered together into *identitas*, is more perfect than the multiplicity of the same perfections.'

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Lectio xv. (p. 159): 'The knowledge of God is infinite, unchangeable, eternal. This is proved, because infinitude, immutability, and eternity are Divine attributes. But all Divine attributes appertain to the essence of God. But the knowledge of God is itself the Divine essence itself. Therefore to it appertain infinitude, immutability, and eternity.'

willed to sustain His spiritual energy by means of prayer and thanksgiving, and to resist temptation by the use of the written word. He willed to employ the processes by which men learn.

Dr. Dale evidently thinks that all these cases are completely parallel, and that as the Son of God so restricted the exercise of His Divine power that His human nature was not, ordinarily speaking, in a special manner sustained by it, so also he restricted the exercise of His Divine knowledge in such a way that it had no necessary effect on His human mind. He bases this opinion on the records of our Lord's life preserved in the Gospels, and in a note of marked ability defends it against a possible charge of irreverence.

'Is there,' he says, 'any irreverence in supposing that He accepted the general traditions of His people in provinces of life lying outside those high and divine regions which for Him were illuminated by the light of the Holy Ghost and the consciousness of His unique relations to the Father? Some of these traditions must—as it seems—have been part of His equipment for life in His childhood; at what time, and for what reason, did He become independent of them? And is it necessary to suppose that all the traditions which we must assume that He accepted in His childhood, and by which His practice as a child was guided, were true? Is it not conceivable, for example, that some spring which He was told that He might drink safely was impure, and that some food which He was told was wholesome was unwholesome? Is it any derogation from His divine greatness and glory to suppose that He may in these particulars have been involved in the intellectual errors of His family as part of the humiliation to which He submitted for our salvation? And if in what I have described as His traditional intellectual equipment there was any element of human error, what limits can we set to the possible presence of that error? May we not say that it was not *He* who was liable to error, but that He accepted, in regions outside the range of spiritual illumination, the defects and limitations of the intellectual condition of the race?' (p. 289).

In criticizing this statement we wish, in the first place, to reaffirm the distinction between absence of knowledge and the possibility of error.<sup>1</sup> If it should be proved ever so clearly that the Son of God willed that His human mind should be without certain branches and facts of knowledge, it would not follow that in His humanity there could be any error. 'Infallibility does not imply omniscience any more than limited

<sup>1</sup> We do not see how the assertion of liability to error can be avoided if Dr. Dale's statement should be accepted. It is fair, however, to notice that he himself finds it possible to avoid the particular phrase: see p. 293.

knowledge implies error. Infallibility may be conferred on a human teacher with very limited knowledge, by a special endowment preserving him from error.<sup>1</sup> And, in the case of our Lord, the assertion of error of any kind is out of the question for those who will fully consider what the Hypostatic Union really means. It would be an awful thing to contemplate the possibility of having to say, 'God was mistaken.'

We have a further objection to make. We think Dr. Dale, in common with other writers, far too easily assumes that passages in the Gospels to which he refers necessarily imply ignorance of facts on the part of our Lord. Be that as it may, however, the existence of such ignorance would not, as we have stated, be incompatible with the entire absence of error which the doctrine of the single Personality of Christ demands; and on this further subject of the extent of the knowledge of our Lord's human mind we may be content to refer to a somewhat full consideration of the teaching of the New Testament which appeared in our own pages three years ago,<sup>2</sup> and to call attention to the wide prevalence within the Church of the belief that the human mind of Christ was so far omniscient as a human mind can be,<sup>3</sup> and to the extreme difficulty of supposing that knowledge actually possessed can be so fully restrained that the Divine knowledge of the Son of God did not communicate itself to the human mind which was indissolubly united to the Person of the Eternal Word.<sup>4</sup>

Our opinion that Dr. Dale has given too little thought, in connexion with this subject, to the truth of the Hypostatic Union is confirmed by the note on 'The Temptations of Our Lord.' The sermon to which the note refers fails, we think, to give proper expression to the necessary sinlessness of Christ. In the note he is careful to say that 'it is incongruous with the whole impression produced by the representation of our Lord in the Four Gospels to speak of Him as "liable" either to error or to sin' (p. 293). Yet immediately afterwards he declines to ascribe to our Lord the impeccability denoted by the phrase 'non posse peccare,' on the ground that the 'alternatives' of 'non posse peccare' and 'posse non peccare' 'are not exhaustive,' 'are metaphysical, not moral

<sup>1</sup> Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 476.

<sup>2</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1892, pp. 297-303.

<sup>3</sup> This belief became general both in the East and in the West.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Bishop Stubbs, *Charge at his Second Visitation*, pp. 17, 18.

alternatives,' 'are philosophical abstractions, and do not cover the whole of life' (p. 293). The line of thought we think it necessary to insist upon is parallel in this case to that in the case of error. The impossibility of sin in the humanity of Christ is the necessary consequence of the two truths of His single and Divine Personality and the absolute holiness of God. And when it is added that Christ was impeccable because the human will which was the instrument of His Divine Person was immovably fixed upon righteousness, the impeccability may be seen to be a moral incapacity of sin rather than such a 'physical necessity' as Dr. Dale dreads to imply.<sup>1</sup>

Nor do we think the passage in which it is stated that the 'human life' of Christ was, 'while He was on earth,' gradually 'more and more completely penetrated with the Divine life of the Eternal Word,' and that 'when He returned to the Father' 'His human life was wholly transfigured by the life of the Eternal Son' (p. 145), is free from a confusion of thought which is due to the same failure to pay sufficient attention to all that is involved in the fact of the falsity of Nestorianism. There is a great deal of difference between saying that the Humanity of Christ was glorified in the Resurrection and the Ascension and speaking of a growing 'penetration' of it by the 'Divine life of the Word.'

It is not impossible to possess a very full and true belief in the Godhead of our Lord and at the same time to be of opinion that His Deity was not made known to any of His disciples until after His Resurrection. This is the position taken up in two of the sermons and in one of the notes. In the latter Dr. Dale defends at some length the interpretation that the phrase 'Son of God' in the confession of St. Peter<sup>2</sup> is not an acknowledgment of Deity, but only 'contained the germ and the substance of the faith which St. Thomas was the first to express' (p. 302) in the words addressed to the risen Christ, 'My Lord and my God.'<sup>3</sup> It is true that the word 'Son' is not free from ambiguity, but the point in the Ministry at which St. Peter's confession was made,<sup>4</sup> the general context of the passage, and our Lord's words of blessing<sup>5</sup> which followed incline us to think that the treat-

<sup>1</sup> This is the meaning of the well-known passage in St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 10. The need of affirming 'non posse peccare' is very well stated in Trench, *Studies on the Gospels*, pp. 27-30.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. xvi. 16; cf. St. Mark, viii. 29, St. Luke ix. 20.

<sup>3</sup> St. John xx. 28.

<sup>4</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1876, pp. 259-64.

<sup>5</sup> St. Matt. xvi. 17.

ment which the incident has received from the genius of two great preachers<sup>1</sup> is as critically sound as it is picturesque.

Dr. Dale's way of regarding Holy Scripture will be looked for with hardly less interest than his treatment of the Incarnation. In the sermon on 'Man' he refers to the 'picturesque and imaginative form' in which the history of 'the original creation of the human race' is found in 'the earlier pages of the Old Testament' (p. 170), and in a note on 'the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament' speaks of the 'noble imaginative form' in which the 'conception' of the 'universe' as 'the free creation of a personal God' is framed 'in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis' (p. 313). In a careful note specially devoted to the early chapters of the Bible, while admitting that 'it would not be perfectly accurate to describe the stories in the early part of the Book of Genesis as myths,' since 'the ordinary myth is the growth of the popular imagination uncontrolled by Divine revelation,' he asserts that 'these stories have a mythical form,' regards it as possible that 'they may have been constructed from popular myths still more ancient than themselves,' and suggests that a fitting name for them is that of 'inspired myths' (pp. 323, 324). He considers the 'recognition of the Holy Spirit' in Psalm li. 'as the source of sanctification' to be 'the most decisive proof of the late date of that psalm' (p. 318). As to the New Testament, he has no doubt 'that Paul wrote the Epistles attributed to him in our Authorised and Revised Versions of the New Testament, with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews; that John wrote the Revelation and the three Epistles bearing his name; . . . that Peter wrote the first of the two Epistles attributed to him; and that the Epistle of James was written by our Lord's "brother," the son of Joseph and Mary, or the son of Joseph by a former wife.' He says that 'the Epistle to the Hebrews is by an unknown writer,' and that 'the Epistle of Jude and the second Epistle of Peter cannot, with any great confidence, be ascribed to their traditional authors.' He regards 'the four Gospels' as containing 'a substantially trustworthy account of our Lord's teaching and of His personal history,' considers 'the evidence for the genuineness and authenticity of the Fourth Gospel' to be 'of a distinct and impressive kind,' and has no hesitation about using 'the Acts of the Apostles' as a work of 'substantial historical trustworthiness' (pp. 282-4). Even with regard to the New Testament he puts aside the question of Inspiration and is

<sup>1</sup> Lacordaire, *Conférence de la Vie Intime de Jésus-Christ*, ad init.; Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 1-11.

content to use the various books as being the 'substantially trustworthy' work of those who were qualified by knowledge to write; although, so far as his own opinion is concerned, it is his belief that 'these writings contain their own evidence that they came from men to whom the glory of Christ and the realities of God's invisible and eternal kingdom had been revealed in a very wonderful and exceptional way' (p. 285).

Thus Dr. Dale's present work recalls in many ways his former very useful book *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*. It is often worth while for Christian students to see how much of the Faith of the Church could be retained on a reversal of many traditional beliefs. It is useful, for instance, to notice that the Deity of Christ could be shown to be a truth held by St. Paul, even if the only extant writings by him should be the Epistle to the Romans, the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Galatians. It is of service, again, to point out that if the Fourth Gospel should be of late date and the first three Gospels merely truthful uninspired histories, it would still be very difficult to say that our Lord did not claim to be God, or that the earliest disciples did not believe Him to be so. And, at first sight, it appears to be a strong position to put aside a great many controverted questions and to base the truth of the Christian religion on a low estimate of a few authorities.

Yet this is a position which, whatever its apparent strength, cannot, by itself, be long held. It is impossible to prevent fresh questions occurring and causing doubt about central truth until they are answered. It is all very well to say that on the teaching of a few books of the New Testament, regarded as uninspired, it must still be admitted that Christ is God and the Redeemer of mankind. Such a statement is true enough, but it must inevitably lead to the inquiry why these few books are to be believed; and, if a satisfactory answer be found to this question, it will again be asked, What did Christ say on this or that subject, and were His sayings such that we can believe them? What did He say about the Church? What does this involve about the authority of the New Testament? Are the necessary inferences from it compatible with the study of history? What did He say about the Apostles, and about His Presence among men, and about the Sacraments? Can His teaching be reconciled with fact and with reason? What did He say about the Old Testament? Can His sayings be accepted by those who have their eyes open to the certain teaching of criticism and history?



And, if on any points He taught falsely, can the first belief that He is God any longer be maintained?

In such inquiries it is impossible to stand still. Those who are seeking for truth are hurried on, in one direction or in another, more quickly than they are often aware.

We do not, then, underrate the value of its being clearly pointed out how much positive truth might still be retained on a hypothetical abandonment of much which Christians in the past have held dear, and on a view of the Church and of Holy Scripture which puts aside any Divine authority in them. But what we desire to emphasize is that the questions which are put aside are certain to recur and to claim answers.

Dr. Dale is evidently a little hurt because some 'critics of former volumes of' his 'have supposed that' he disparages 'the function of the Church as "the pillar and ground of the truth"' (p. 305). He describes in one of the lengthy notes which we have found the most interesting part of his attractive volume the view which he takes of Church authority.

'I find,' he says, "the pillar and ground of the truth" in the actual life of those who have received the Christian salvation. The biography of saints is a higher authority than the decrees of councils. If through age men living in different countries, belonging to different races, disciplined under different conditions, associated with Churches separated from each other by long-standing and bitter controversies, agree in declaring that they have trusted in the Lord Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sin, and that, in answer to their trust, they were released from the sense and burden of their guilt, and found peace with God; that they trusted Him for life and strength to do the will of God, and that the life and strength were given; if it is apparent that the more vehement their affection for Him, and the more complete their devotion to Him, the loftier were their attainments in righteousness; if, under different and even conflicting forms of theological statement, there is a singular and surprising unity in their testimony that themselves found access to God and deliverance from sin, as well as the remission of guilt, through the Lord Jesus Christ—these facts appear to me to be of immense importance as confirming, establishing, and illustrating the contents of the original Christian Gospel. For me, the doctrinal authority of the Church lies in the experience of the Church. Its experience constitutes its authority—the experience of the commonality of those who have received the Christian redemption. I listen with respect to the early Fathers, in whose teaching it is reasonable to suppose that the large outlines of apostolic tradition have been preserved; but while listening to them I feel at liberty to discriminate between what obviously belongs to the tradition and what seems to have been derived from other sources. I listen with respect to the great theologians of

all Churches ; but I claim perfect freedom to discuss and dispute their interpretations of Holy Scripture, to criticize their methods, and to test the strength of their logic. But the actual experience of penitents and saints is sacred to me ; even in this I must endeavour to distinguish between the Divine substance and the human form in which it appears ; but I must do it reverently, for when we are in immediate contact with the Divine life of man we are in contact with the presence and power of the Spirit of God. The *Confessions* of Augustine are of more authority than his theological treatises. Bunyan's *Grace Abounding* is of more authority than Calvin's *Institutes*. I believe in the inspiration of the Church, and I find that inspiration in its life' (pp. 307-8).

It is obvious how much this statement has in common with the Catholic doctrine of the authority of the Church, and part of it recalls well-known passages in which Irenæus<sup>1</sup> and Tertullian<sup>2</sup> and Vincent of Lerins<sup>3</sup> spoke of the test of truth. It is clear, also, how greatly it differs from the belief which we have called Catholic. If it lays stress on the really Apostolic character of a tradition and the universality with which it is accepted, it leaves out of sight the promises made by our Lord of the work of the Holy Spirit<sup>4</sup> and the perpetual protection of the Church.<sup>5</sup> It fails, as we should have anticipated would be the case from one in Dr. Dale's position, to face the highly important question as to what the limits of the Church are to be held to be. It is of too subjective a character to supply a sufficiently strong basis of belief and life.

Dr. Dale's criticisms on what he regards as the theory of the authority of General Councils show that he has not really grasped the position which we ourselves regard as Catholic. He speaks of this theory as assuming that a fully representative General Council is in itself infallible, as being the 'inspired organ of the Faith of the universal Church' (pp. 306, 307). The language he uses fails to make allowance for the necessity that if a Council, fully representative or otherwise, is to be Œcumenical, its decisions must receive the subsequent acceptance of the Church.

We must not omit to notice the three sermons on the Atonement. Even those who are familiar with Dr. Dale's large work on the subject will do well to read them. They state and illustrate with much force the sacrificial efficacy of the death of Christ. They point out the essential difference

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, *C. Har.* I. x. 1, 2, III. iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Tert. *De Præs. Heret.* xxxvi.

<sup>3</sup> St. Vinc. Ler. *Commonitorium*, ii. (§ 6).

<sup>4</sup> St. John xiv. 16, 17, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13.

<sup>5</sup> St. Matt. xvi. 18.

between this doctrine and the idea that 'Christ achieves our redemption by revealing God's love for us' (p. 218). They show how the doctrine is verified in the lives of Christians. Some of the objections commonly brought against the doctrine are answered, and the Atonement is regarded as being itself a revelation of God and His dealings with man, and as thus being a sign of 'the existence of a unique and most intimate connexion between the Son of God and the human race' (p. 258), of the freedom and willingness of God to forgive sins, and of the possibility of attaining in Christ to the Father. Amid much that is valuable, perhaps the most valuable feature is the strong sense of the guilt of sin and the necessity and reality of divine forgiveness—a sense which has been the animating force of the Church's greatest theologians, but which at the present time we seem in some danger of losing. So far as such a danger is real there is need of Dr. Dale's warning:

'We cannot easily escape from the power of the life of our contemporaries. We think as they think; we feel as they feel. Only a few elect souls in any generation can leave the multitude and ascend to those Divine heights in which they can hear for themselves the voice of God; the communion of saints is necessary even to *them*; and even they must be more or less deeply affected by the spirit and temper of their generation. Not until the sense of the guilt of sin and the craving for the Divine Forgiveness become as general, as earnest, and as intense as the desire for moral and spiritual perfection will the Death of Christ as an Atonement for sin inspire a deep and passionate gratitude, or recover its ancient place in the thought and life of the Christian Church' (p. 254).

Both in the teaching on the Atonement and in that about the Holy Spirit we have strongly felt the need of additions which might show the relation of the Sacraments to the forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost. It is as the sacramental means of union with Christ and of receiving the Spirit are kept in view that what Dr. Dale so well says will have its true value.

There is much more in Dr. Dale's volume on the importance and power of which we should have liked to comment, and there are a few other passages which, in our opinion, call for criticism; but we must hasten on to notice the distinction which he makes between belief in and the knowledge of God. To him the 'belief in the existence of God' is part of a 'great tradition' (p. 5), and it becomes of real service to the soul only as it passes on to 'knowledge.' He describes various ways in which this 'knowledge' is attained, as the glory of Nature is

seen to be the vehicle of the Divine glory, or as the splendour of Nature postulates the God who made it, or as the intelligible order in the universe denotes an intelligent Power to whom it is due, so that the 'ultimate realities' of 'the world, self, God' (p. 22), become known. To these are added the sense of the moral law, and of guilt in transgressing it, the dread of future judgment, and the revelation of Christ, each of which, and pre-eminently the last, postulate the existence of God. By such means as these, in his view, the old 'belief' becomes a real part of the man who has inherited it, and so is developed into 'knowledge.'

'Belief' and 'knowledge' are among the most difficult words which a theologian can use. 'Belief' may denote an easy acquiescence in something about which no thought has ever been exercised, or a mere intellectual acceptance of that which has no influence upon the life; or it may be used for that intense act of the whole soul which marks the character profoundly and is called 'Faith' by St. Paul. 'Knowledge,' again, may mean a condition of mind in which the intellect alone works, or it may have the higher meaning Dr. Dale assigns to it, of that inner and spiritual knowledge whereby the soul realizes its friendship with God.

It is a thankless task to dispute about words, and if we do not altogether like the sharp distinctions in the terminology of the sermons on this subject we must express our appreciation of the truth they are evidently meant to convey, that man's need is to deeply realize and earnestly seek after God, and learn, in the sense of St. John, to know Him.<sup>1</sup>

We may not conceal our belief that the work under review might have gained greatly if its author held doctrines on the Church and the Sacraments which he would repudiate as untrue additions to the Gospel of Christ. It is no light matter that these doctrines are so far set aside as they are in the present volume. It is true that the place for the full consideration of them would come rather in the 'second series' of sermons, which the preface (p. viii) leads us to expect; but different opinions than those which we understand Dr. Dale holds would have led to some modification of parts of the present series.

But this is not the thought which is most prominent in our minds as we close the book. The impression left upon us is much more from what the sermons and the notes contain than from what they omit. A volume like this suggests to Churchmen high hopes of future possibilities. We cannot

<sup>1</sup> 1 St. John ii. 3, iii. 6.

minimize the loss which we believe it to be to any religious body to be without the ordered government and supernatural powers of episcopacy. But Dr. Dale's positive teaching shows a wide field of common ground between him and ourselves. His earnest spirit fills our thoughts with anticipations of better understandings between Churchmen and Nonconformists. And where there is common ground and a resolution to understand one another there is hope that by degrees those who are divided may be brought together. If such a hope, so far as the reunion of English Nonconformists to the Church is concerned, is ever to be realized, it will be largely through such teaching and through such spiritual force as this volume exhibits.

---

#### ART. IX.—THE YOUNGER POETS.

1. *Poems.* By WILLIAM WATSON. (London, 1892.)
2. *Lachrymæ Musarum, and other Poems.* By WILLIAM WATSON. (London, 1892.)
3. *Odes, and other Poems.* By WILLIAM WATSON. (London, 1894.)
4. *Fleet Street Eclogues.* By JOHN DAVIDSON. (London, 1893.)
5. *Ballads and Songs.* By JOHN DAVIDSON. (London, 1894.)
6. *Poems.* By FRANCIS THOMPSON. (London, 1893.)

SPECULATION in minor poets is nearly as exciting and uncertain a pursuit as speculation in mining shares. The market varies with almost equal rapidity, and with (to the outsider) apparently an equal lack of reason. There are certain publishers who make a speciality of this form of literary investment, just as there is a 'Kaffir Circus,' as it is elegantly termed, on the Stock Exchange. From time to time certain issues are 'boomed' for all they are worth, and, it may be, a trifle more; the commodity is duly unloaded on the receptive world, and then relapses to a more natural level when the speculation is diverted towards a different object. In the literary gamble all the objects of this speculation have a certain intrinsic value, no doubt, which is more than can be said for their commercial counterparts; but it is very hard for the outsider to ascertain at first precisely what that value is: 'I have seen three-and-twenty leaders of revolts,' murmurs

the Pope's legate as he rides into Faenza to take stock of the twenty-fourth; and the literary student may say much the same of the 'real poets' who have been successively introduced to his notice, have lived their little day, and then gone the way of the last year's snows. Some disheartened readers give up the pursuit in despair, and, falling back on the advice of a person of importance in his own day, and therewith a minor poet himself, read an old poet whenever a new one is announced. Others persevere, faint yet pursuing, looking always hopefully for the coming of the true poet, that they may be ready to give him proper greeting when he comes.

It is an obvious truth that we are at present passing through a period of depression in poetry, not, indeed, in respect of quantity, but of quality. One of the great poets of the Victorian age is still left to us, and the marvellous music of his verse seems to suffer little change or diminution from the lapse of years. Another, less great but yet a true poet, is alive, but silent, declining any longer to be 'the idle singer of an empty day.' The rest are gone, and we are left with a crowd of lesser writers, gifted with many of the qualities that go to make up a poet, but lacking the final grace of greatness. In this there is nothing strange, and nothing to cause despondency for the future of our literature. The history of English poetry is the history of successive ebbs and floods. Chaucer, Spenser and Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Wordsworth and Shelley, Tennyson and Browning, are the high-water marks of our poetic achievement, and between them lie periods of relapse, of declining vigour and returning strength. Complaints of decadence in every branch of human achievement are as old as the human race, and have an unbroken pedigree from that earliest relic of Egyptian literature which laments the deterioration of mankind about the year 3400 B.C., to the newspaper articles which sum up the occurrences of 1894. We have suffered worse things than these, and it may be that the future historian of the nineteenth century, looking back over another age of splendid literary performance, will be able to say that at this very time another of the immortals was among us, and had even begun to carve out his way to fame.

Whether this be so or not, the actual verse of to-day is in itself, and without reference to its promise for the future, well worth the attention of to-day, and it is with a generous competition that the critics try to discern the first sign of poetic merit, and to bring forward those who strive for the poetic name. The three writers whose most notable works



we have prefixed to this article are those who occupy for the moment the principal place among our younger poets. It may be that one of them is the coming poet for whom we seek ; but it is certain that they have already written verse of no mean or inconsiderable merit. It can hardly be other than a pleasant task to review the work that they have done, and to try to gather up what there is in it of excellence in the past and what hope of higher achievement in the future.

In both respects we have no hesitation in giving the first place among the younger poets of the day to Mr. William Watson. It is little more than two years since the general public became aware of his name, when the beauty of his panegyric on the dead Laureate made some eager admirers believe that he would be found the fittest successor to the vacated dignity. More sober judgments hesitated, and they hesitate still ; but few lovers of poetry will deny to Mr. Watson a certain distinction and loftiness of tone which gave much ground for his admirers' estimate. Mr. Watson has been writing, or rather has been giving his writings to the world, for fourteen years, but the bulk of his work is still small. Five thin volumes hold all the verse that he has published, and no great economy of space would be needed to concentrate all their contents into a single volume of very moderate size. He has as yet tried no long poem ; the most are odes, sonnets, epigrams, and occasional pieces. Partly this is due to a very praiseworthy fastidiousness, which forbids him to give anything but finished work to the public ; partly—and this is a fact that will have to be considered in estimating his rank as a poet—it arises from a scantiness of inspiration. It is no impertinence to say this, for he has told us so himself :

'Not mine the rich and showering hand, that strews  
The facile largess of a stintless Muse.  
A fitful presence, seldom tarrying long,  
Capriciously she touches me to song—  
Then leaves me to lament her flight in vain,  
And wonder will she ever come again.'<sup>1</sup>

Three only of Mr. Watson's five volumes need be taken into serious consideration. *The Prince's Quest* (1880, reprinted in 1893) is a slight collection of early verse, reissued when Mr. Watson had begun to make a name by his later work ; and *The Eloping Angels* (1893) is, as its title-page declares, a caprice, graceful enough, like all Mr. Watson's writings, but

<sup>1</sup> *Poems*, p. 3.

with no serious bearing on his fame. Of the remaining three, the *Poems* contains the thoughtful and elaborate meditation on 'Wordsworth's Grave,' which, if we mistake not, was the first of Mr. Watson's poems to win pronounced commendation. *Lachrymæ Musarum* has the splendid elegy on Tennyson, the fittest tribute to the Laureate's memory that has yet been spoken in literature; and the *Odes and other Poems* is Mr. Watson's latest gift, to which his admirers will turn with eagerness to learn to what extent it justifies the high expectations which his earlier volumes had produced. How far they are likely to be satisfied is a point to which we shall return presently.

The most conspicuous qualities of Mr. Watson's poetry are lucidity and sanity, a clear, healthy vision, and a carefully trained precision of phrase. The literary ancestors to whom he owes most of his inspiration are Milton and Wordsworth, but in his own cast of mind he is near akin to the polished writers of the eighteenth century. All his work is elaborated and perfected with the utmost care, and all the expressive words have been deliberately chosen for their particular place. He has none of the indifference to epithets which has been noticed as an attribute of Scott's rapid verse; on the contrary, it is in the epithets that his artistic elaboration is most evident. Most of his better poems up to the present have been appreciations of the great poets of the past, whether in the form of elegy or of meditation, and in these compositions his cultivated felicity of epithet has full scope. His versification is smooth and harmonious, effective, though not as yet distinguished. But what bespeaks for him at once the favour of all lovers of literature is his lofty sense of the dignity of the poetic calling, and the spirit of reverence with which he regards and strives to follow the great poets of the past. Mr. Watson is full of the great traditions of English poetry, and if he is destined one day to take his place in the 'transfigured band' of those whose excellencies he has worshipped, he will hand on those traditions without break or stain to those who may come after him in their turn. We may have our hours of revolt against the tyranny of the great dead, whose merits are dinned into our ears to shame our lesser achievements; there is much temptation to run amuck at times among traditions and conventions, to question everything, to test everything, to demand to stand upon our own feet; but when this salutary desire to form our own judgments and reject ready-made opinions is past, it is a sign of a sober and balanced judgment to come back to a full

recognition of the greatness of the old masters. The spirit of revolt lends itself to rhetoric, but rhetoric seldom produces verse of permanent merit.

In Mr. Watson's first noticeable volume, the collected *Poems* of 1892, all the qualities of which we have spoken are manifested. It is natural that early verse should show with some clearness the models which the author has most studied and imitated. It does not need the poem of 'Wordsworth's Grave' to tell us the name of the poet whom Mr. Watson has most conspicuously followed. The influence of Wordsworth is visible in nearly every poem, notably in a series of sonnets on the political occurrences of 1885, which are closely modelled on Wordsworth's *Sonnets to National Independence and Liberty*. Many lines, and even whole sonnets, might have been written by the master instead of the pupil:

'Yet . . . when I glance abroad, and track the source,  
More selfish far, of other nations' deed,  
And mark their tortuous craft, their jealous greed,  
Their serpent-wisdom or mere soulless force,  
Homeward returns my vagrant fealty,  
Crying, "O England, should'st thou one day fall,  
Shattered in ruins by some Titan foe,  
Justice were henceforth weaker throughout all  
The world, and Truth less passionately free,  
And God the poorer for thine overthrow."<sup>1</sup>

Or:

'And with unnumbered isles barbaric, she  
The broad hem of her glistening robe impearl'd;  
Then, when she wound her arms about the world,  
And had for vassal the obsequious sea.'<sup>2</sup>

Or:

'But were she the same England, made to feel  
A brightness gone from out those starry eyes,  
A splendour from that constellated brow?'<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, the failing of these poems, and of others in the same volume, is that they remind us too frequently and too strongly of the models from which they are copied. They are fine, both in thought and in expression; but the same thing has been done a trifle (or more than a trifle) better by another. A second poet, whom some of the verses in this volume recall almost more strongly than Wordsworth, is Matthew Arnold; not so much by direct imitation, as because Matthew Arnold and Mr. Watson are of the same poetic lineage, a profound admiration for Wordsworth combined

<sup>1</sup> *Poems*, p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 103.

with a strong critical judgment. The poem of 'Wordsworth's Grave' inevitably recalls such pieces as Arnold's 'Memorial Verses' and 'Obermann,' and again the reflection is inevitable that, though the later poet is good, the older is better.

'Not Milton's keen, translunar music thine;  
Not Shakespeare's cloudless, boundless human view;  
Not Shelley's flush of rose on peaks divine;  
Nor yet the wizard twilight Coleridge knew.

What hadst thou that could make so large amends  
For all thou had'st not and thy peers possessed,  
Motion and fire, swift means to radiant ends?—  
Thou hadst, for weary feet, the gift of rest.'<sup>1</sup>

Or, again, the brilliant sketch of English poetry in the eighteenth century:

'Unflushed with ardour and unblanched with awe,  
Her lips in profitless derision curled,  
She saw with dull emotion—if she saw—  
The vision of the glory of the world.

The age grew sated with her sterile wit.  
Herself waxed weary on her loveless throne.  
Men felt life's tide, the sweep and surge of it,  
And craved a living voice, a natural tone.

From dewy pastures, uplands sweet with thyme,  
A virgin breeze freshened the jaded day.  
It wafted Collins' lonely vesper-chime,  
It breathed abroad the frugal note of Gray.'<sup>2</sup>

In these stanzas, and the others which accompany them, every epithet is carefully chosen, and the note of literary allusion, fully expressive only to those acquainted with the authors of whom mention is made, is struck again and again with happy effect. 'Wordsworth's Grave' is unquestionably a very noteworthy poem, and one which was rightly marked by more than one literary critic as indicating that its author might have a very distinguished future before him.

That estimate was confirmed and justified by Mr. Watson's next volume, *Lachrymæ Musarum*. It contains but eighteen poems, occupying no more than seventy-eight liberally printed pages; yet there is scarcely a poem which does not show the hand of a real master. There is the same studied felicity of phrase, the same clear, if somewhat cold, lucidity; and there is a more original touch, a stronger grasp,

<sup>1</sup> *Poems*, p. 136.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 139-41.

in every way a development of poetic power. No doubt the finest poem in the collection, and to our mind the finest poem that Mr. Watson has yet written, is the elegy on Lord Tennyson, which gives its name to the volume. The freshness of the loss which it commemorates, touches it with a warmth and emotion which were wanting to the more calmly reflective tribute to Wordsworth, and which raise it to a higher plane of poetry. It is stately and dignified, reverent but not effusive, as befits the expression of a national sorrow for one who has gone to his rest full of years and honour, leaving behind a legacy of immortal works :

'Low, like another's, lies the laurelled head :  
The life that seemed a perfect song is o'er :  
Carry the last great bard to his last bed.  
Land that he loved, thy noblest voice is mute.  
Land that he loved, that loved him ! nevermore  
Meadow of thine, smooth lawn or wild sea-shore,  
Gardens of odorous bloom and tremulous fruit,  
Or woodlands old, like Druid couches spread,  
The master's feet shall tread.  
Death's little rift hath rent the faultless lute :  
The singer of undying songs is dead.

For he hath joined the chorus of his peers  
In habitations of the perfect day :  
His earthly notes a heavenly audience hears,  
And more melodious are henceforth the spheres,  
Enriched with music stol'n from earth away.

He hath returned to regions whence he came,  
Him doth the spirit divine  
Of universal loveliness reclaim.  
All nature is his shrine.  
Seek him henceforward in the wind and sea,  
In earth's and air's emotion or repose,  
In every star's august serenity  
And in the rapture of the flaming rose.  
There seek him if ye would not seek in vain,  
There, in the rhythm and music of the whole ;  
Yea and for ever in the human soul  
Made stronger and more beauteous by his strain.'<sup>1</sup>

If this does not quite attain to the level of the three supreme elegies by poets upon poets, *Lycidas*, *Adonais*, *Thyrsis*, it yet ranks very high among compositions of its class, and places its author in the forefront of contemporary verse.

<sup>1</sup> *Lachrymæ Musarum*, pp. 1-5.

Akin to the elegy on Tennyson is the poem commemorating the centenary of Shelley. Mr. Watson has so far been most successful when he has been writing about his brother poets. His sobriety of judgment, his sense of the great traditions of English literature, and his precision of language, are especially suited to such work, and his appreciation of Shelley is a fine example of his powers. Shelley was his first love, as he has elsewhere told us, and his early admiration finds a fitting expression in this poem. But this is a class of subject soon exhausted. One would wish to see Mr. Watson develop some other theme, and in this respect the longest poem in *Lachrymæ Musarum* marked a new departure. In 'The Dream of Man' Mr. Watson describes a vision of man's successive victories in every sphere of knowledge, culminating in his triumph over Death; and how this triumph, by leaving nothing further to conquer, and by robbing man of all cause alike for hope and fear, left him a prey to unutterable weariness and satiety, till he besought God to release Death once more:

'And behold his Soul rejoiced not,  
The breath of whose being was strife,  
For life with nothing to vanquish  
Seemed but the shadow of life.  
No goal invited and promised  
And divinely provocative shone;  
And Fear having fled, her sister,  
Blest Hope, in her train was gone.  
And the crowning and cope of achievement  
Was hell than defeat more dire—  
The torment of all-things-compassed,  
The plague of nought-to-desire.  
And Man the invincible queller,  
Man with his foot on his foes,  
In boundless satiety hung'red,  
Restless from utter repose.  
Victor of nature, victor  
Of the prince of the powers of the air,  
By mighty weariness vanquished,  
And crowned with august despair.'<sup>1</sup>

This poem, the moral of which is identical with that of Browning's 'Rephan,' shows a greater strength of imagination than Mr. Watson has elsewhere displayed; and, though not his best work, it is perhaps the most full of promise for the future. The remaining pieces in this volume are shorter and of less importance, but they maintain the high level of

<sup>1</sup> *Lachrymæ Musarum*, p. 29.



excellence reached by the longer poems, and serve to complete a volume of very unusual charm.

The question now presents itself whether Mr. Watson's last volume, *Odes and other Poems*, is worthy of the promise of his earlier work, and to this question only a qualified answer can be given. To those who looked for some work of altogether greater strength and scope, a larger flight of the poet's wings, it is something of a disappointment. The range of attempt is no wider than before, the subjects are of the same class, and are treated in the same manner. We gratefully recognize the same good qualities as before, the same finish of style, the same loftiness of aspiration; but we cannot say that the new poems mark any real advance on what he had done already. Mr. Watson has, however, himself indicated a cause (to which, had he not mentioned it himself, we should have been unwilling to refer) which goes far to account for this check on his progress. We quote from the fine poem on Spring, entitled 'Vita Nuova':

'I too have come through wintry terrors, yea,  
Through tempest and through cataclysm of soul  
Have come and am delivered. Me the Spring,  
Me also, dimly with new life hath touched,  
And with regenerate hope, the salt of life.'<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Watson's recent illness, coupled with the fastidiousness of his production, accounts for the comparative slowness of his new volume, and the absence of any decided step in advance. Meanwhile the work in itself is good, and our hopes of a greater future for Mr. Watson are only deferred, not overthrown. The new poems include a confession of poetic faith, gracefully addressed to Mr. H. D. Traill, one or two fine sonnets (notably 'France' and 'Night on Curbar Edge'), a pretty song to 'the first skylark of spring' which succeeds in avoiding comparison with either Shelley or Wordsworth, a legend of St. Peter in heroic couplets, and a rather large proportion of what may be best described as occasional poems on passing events. From the first-named of these poems we may select some characteristic stanzas:

'But though all life and death and birth,  
And all the heaven's enzoning girth,  
Earth, and the waters 'neath the earth,  
Are Song's domain,  
Nor aught so lowly but is worth  
The loftiest strain,—

<sup>1</sup> *Odes and other Poems*, p. 46.

'Tis from those moods in which Life stands  
 With feet earth-planted, yet with hands  
 Stretched toward visionary lands,

Where vapours lift  
 A moment, and ærial strands  
 Gleam through the rift,

The poet wins, in hours benign,  
 At older than the Delphic shrine,  
 Those intimations faint and fine,

To which belongs  
 Whatever character divine  
 Invest his songs.

And could we live more near allied  
 To cloud and mountain, wind and tide,  
 Cast this unmeaning coil aside,

And go forth free,  
 The World our goal, Desire our guide,—  
 We then might see

Those master moments grow less rare,  
 And oftener feel that nameless air  
 Come rumouring from we know not where ;

And touch at whiles  
 Fantastic shores, the fringes fair  
 Of fairy isles.<sup>1</sup>

Space forbids us to quote at greater length from this volume, which all lovers of poetry will receive with gratitude for the good work contained in it, though with regret that it is not planned on a larger and more ambitious scale. It is for this that Mr. Watson's admirers are now looking. So far as he has gone already we may say (reverting to the metaphor with which this article began) that his genius is of real precious metal, but that the vein is a thin one. Thin veins of ore sometimes broaden and deepen as they go onward, and it is our hope that this may be the case with Mr. Watson. He has the aspirations, the training, the technique of a true poet ; what he at present lacks is the higher inspiration. If he has strength enough for a sustained effort of imagination, without losing the finished manner of his earlier work, then he will be of the company of the poets whose fame has been so dear to him. Of his prose writings we need not speak. They are, as their title indicates, the 'Excursions of a Rhymers' into a realm which is not his own. There he has many equals and superiors ; indeed, even his literary taste seems to desert him, since we find him (in the introduction to

<sup>1</sup> *Odes and other Poems*, p. 8.

his anthology of love poems entitled *Lyric Love*) totally failing to appreciate the charm of the Elizabethan song-writers. But this matters little. It is as a poet, not as a critic of poets, that we look to Mr. Watson, in the hope that he may yet win his place in the great company of English singers.

Indeed, if Mr. Watson is not the poet of the future, we shall be at a loss where to find him. It is true that, if the phrases of reviewers could be trusted, there would be little difficulty in finding, not one merely, but many poets of the first order among us at this day; but a reviewer who knows how hard it is to hold the balance even between the present and the past, to be just without being either cold or effusive, will not criticize too curiously the phrases of others. One writer, whose verse has been conspicuously praised by critics of no mean order, is Mr. John Davidson. From the Press notices which his publisher thoughtfully appends to his latest volume, in order that the reader may be spared the trouble of forming an opinion for himself, one learns (if one does not know it already) that he is a very remarkable writer indeed. 'John Davidson,' we are told, 'is a prodigal of every divine gift, pouring out untold treasure from his celestial cornucopia. Fancy and imagination, wit and humour, fun and epigram, characterization and creation and observation, insight and philosophy, passion and emotion and sincerity—all are his.' These are big words. If for 'John Davidson' you read 'William Shakespeare,' the sentence might stand; but if you substituted Milton or Wordsworth or Byron, the critics would begin to demur; and how, then, of John Davidson? The fact is that all depends on the scale by which you measure. Helvellyn is a noble mountain, on which much wealth of description may be lavished; but we should hardly speak of it in the same terms if it stood beneath the shadow of the Matterhorn. Among the contemporary writers of verse, Mr. Davidson *has* a distinctly remarkable individuality, and his verse may be read with real pleasure and gratitude; but we do not see, in anything that he has written already, such qualities as to make us look to him to be the successor of Tennyson and Browning and Swinburne.

Mr. Davidson's most notable work is contained in his *Fleet Street Eclogues* and his new volume of *Ballads and Songs*. The former consists of a series of lyrical dialogues, held at different seasons of the year by a group of literary men. The form of the 'eclogue,' with its literary associations that carry us back to Virgil and Theocritus, throws

over them a veil of graceful unreality ; but through all, in all the four principal speakers, we see the picture of a London man of letters, half journalist and half poet, eating out his heart in Fleet Street, often with a high enthusiasm for his calling, oftener with a weary despair at the apparent uselessness of it all, which finds its only refreshment in the memory, or, better still, the sight of country scenes and animals and flowers. There are many passages of great vigour and beauty. The despondent journalist complains that the dragons of gutter-writings 'have doomed Religion and poetry,' and he is answered :

'They may doom till the moon forsakes  
Her dark, star-daisied lawn ;  
They may doom till doomsday breaks  
With angels to trumpet the dawn ;  
While love enchants the young,  
And the old have sorrow and care,  
No song shall be unsung,  
Unprayed no prayer.'<sup>1</sup>

And the same speaker waxes eloquent in praise of journalism :

'When the damsel had her bower,  
And the lady kept her state,  
The splendour and the power  
That made adventure great,  
Were not more strong and splendid  
Than the subtle might we wield ;  
Though chivalry be ended,  
There are champions in the field.  
Nor are we warriors giftless :  
Deep magic's in our stroke ;  
Ours are the shoes of swiftness :  
And ours the darkling cloak ;  
We fear no golden charmer ;  
We dread no form of words ;  
We wear enchanted armour,  
We wield enchanted swords.'<sup>2</sup>

But the most notable feature of the 'Eclogues' is the descriptions of country scenery with which they abound. It is true that such descriptions are the commonplace of the modern minor poet. The country was rediscovered by Wordsworth, and the great poets of this reign have been conspicuous for their accurate observation and admirable use of natural scenery as a background or accessory ; but it is the minor poet who puts his whole strength into such descrip-

<sup>1</sup> *Fleet Street Eclogues*, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

tions, and makes them the sole motive of poem after poem. Mr. Davidson's pictures have, however, a human reference, and in themselves they are true (if we may except the earth-stopper at work on Christmas Eve, which, we fear, would imply hunting on Christmas Day) and picturesque. For instance:

‘Once, in June  
Upstream I went to hear the summer tune  
The birds sing at Long Ditton in a vale  
Sacred to him who wrote his own heart's tale.  
Of singing birds that hollow is the haunt;  
Never was such a place for singing in!  
The valley overflows with song and chaunt,  
And brimming echoes spill the pleasant din.  
High in the oak-trees where the fresh leaves sprout,  
The blackbirds with their oboe voices make  
The sweetest broken music all about  
The beauty of the day for beauty's sake.’<sup>1</sup>

Or this extract from a poet's vision:

‘I saw a sky of purple gloom,  
That glowed as from a Tyrian loom,  
And blushing hills perfumed with heath,  
And flower-decked valleys hung beneath,  
Where water purred a signal noise,  
Melodious, like an angel's voice.  
And there were forests great and old,  
The carpet of whose fertile mould  
Was woven of ferns and lustrous flowers;  
And caves were there and pleasant bowers;  
And rocks, immortally undressed,  
That shone through many a loose green vest.’<sup>2</sup>

The special characteristics of Mr. Davidson are freshness, vigour, rhetoric, independence. There is nothing strikingly original about his ideas, but they are expressed with an energy which proves them to be genuine opinions and not conventional. Of all minor poets, the most minor is commonly the meditative bard, who moralizes on the scenery which he minutely describes. The end of that is tedium; but Mr. Davidson's most hostile critic would not call him tedious. His rhetorical qualities come out more strongly in his recent volume of *Ballads and Songs*. We are not concerned to defend the opinions expressed in them, least of all the (in substance) trite and shallow declamation against Christianity, which Mr. Davidson, like other ephemeral writers of all ages, appears to identify with warring kings and persecuting priests;

<sup>1</sup> *Fleet Street Eclogues*, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 61.

but we willingly acknowledge the vigour with which they are put into verse. For the two longest ballads, indeed, the 'Ballad in Blank Verse of the Making of a Poet' and the 'Ballad of the Exodus from Houndsditch,' we do not greatly care. Declamations against pseudo-Christianity are neither new nor useful, and it requires no great courage on a writer's part to knock down a dummy which he has himself erected. Only the strenuous rhetorical style of the latter redeems it from commonplace. The two finest poems in the volume, to our mind, are the 'Ballad of a Nun' and the 'Ballad of Heaven,' while 'Thirty Bob a Week' is a striking sketch of a London clerk's life, worthy to rank with Mr. Kipling's *Barrack-Room Ballads*. The central idea of the former is somewhat difficult to justify in cold blood, but the description of the convent with which it begins is one of the best things of the kind which Mr. Davidson has done.

'High on a hill the convent hung,  
Across a duchy looking down,  
Where everlasting mountains flung  
Their shadows over tower and town.

The jewels of their lofty snows  
In constellations flashed at night;  
Above their crests the moon arose;  
The deep earth shuddered with delight.

Long ere she left her cloudy bed,  
Still dreaming in the orient land,  
On many a mountain's happy head  
Dawn lightly laid her rosy hand.

The adventurous sun took Heaven by storm;  
Clouds scattered largesses of rain;  
The sounding cities, rich and warm,  
Smouldered and glittered in the plain.'<sup>1</sup>

We have, perhaps, already quoted overmuch; but we cannot refrain from giving, as a last sample of Mr. Davidson's quality, the conclusion of the 'Ballad of Heaven.' A musician, wrapt in his art, has seen his wife and child die, and his heart breaks as he feels his work unaccomplished and those whom he loved dead. He dies, and finds his music in heaven.

'God, smiling, took him by the hand,  
And led him to the brink of heaven:  
He saw where systems whirling stand,  
Where galaxies like snow are driven.

<sup>1</sup> *Ballads and Songs*, p. 52.



Dead silence reigned ; a shudder ran  
 Through space ; Time furled his wearied wings ;  
 A slow adagio then began  
 Sweetly resolving troubled things.

The dead were heralded along :  
 As if with drums and trumps of flame,  
 And flutes and oboes keen and strong,  
 A brave andante singing came.

Then like a python's sumptuous dress  
 The frame of things was cast away,  
 And out of Time's obscure distress  
 The conquering scherzo thundered Day.

He doubted ; but God said " Even so :  
 Nothing is lost that's wrought with tears :  
 The music that you made below  
 Is now the music of the spheres." <sup>1</sup>

We have found much to admire, much to enjoy, in Mr. Davidson's verse ; but we do not think that in him we have the poet of the future. Mr. Davidson is an accomplished man of letters, skilled in prose as well as in verse ; a dramatic writer of some merit, with gifts of strength and independence, of rhythm and rhetoric, which make all his work interesting. But these are not enough to carry a man's work far beyond his own day. He lacks the greatness of conception, the literary tradition, and the high ideal which we look for in the great poet, and of which we found some share in the writer of whom we were speaking just now. Mr. Davidson has done well what he has taken in hand ; but he has not aimed so high as Mr. Watson. To both we owe our thanks ; but to Mr. Watson more of our admiration.

One young writer remains whose claims to be the coming poet were trumpeted in no measured tone (not by himself, be it said) some fifteen months ago. To Mr. Coventry Patmore belongs the credit of having 'discovered' Mr. Francis Thompson, whose first and only volume of verses came with all the shock of a complete surprise on the world of readers. Amid all the volumes of poetry for which the printing press is annually responsible, nothing had in the least resembled the manner of this new writer. A young poet is inevitably imitative to some extent ; but Mr. Thompson's prototype is found, not in Tennyson or Keats, not in Wordsworth or the poets of the last century, but in the religious poets of the Stuart period. In audacity of phrase, in far-fetched conceits, in coinage of new and strange words, in exuberance of figure

<sup>1</sup> *Ballads and Songs*, p. 77.

and metaphor, even in lapses of taste and exaggeration of fancifulness, he finds his literary ancestors in Vaughan and Herbert, Cowley and Crashaw. Mr. Thompson is, indeed, the very antithesis of Mr. William Watson. He has the exuberance of invention which the other lacks; but, on the other hand, he has none of the self-restraint, the fastidiousness, the artistic finish, the transparent lucidity, which make Mr. Watson's verse so pleasant to the cultured taste. Mr. Thompson does violence to our taste in every page, yet wins pardon by the gorgeous fancy which inspires him. Much of his verse is as intolerable as much of *Endymion*, but it has much, too, of the promise of *Endymion*. If Mr. Thompson has his development before him; if he can acquire taste and judgment; if he can tame the luxuriance of his fancy, and keep his Pegasus under bridle, he may yet produce something which will be as great an advance on his first volume as *Saint Agnes' Eve* and *Hyperion* are upon *Endymion*. Everything depends upon this acquisition of artistic mastery over his materials; for in the other gifts of the poet, imagination and warmth of feeling and a sense of rhythm, he has shown already that he is richly endowed. The reader who wishes to see Mr. Thompson's extravagance at its height may be referred to 'A Corymbus for Autumn'; we prefer to quote, as the one example of his work which our space will admit, some lines from the fine poem entitled 'The Hound of Heaven':

'I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;  
 I fled Him, down the arches of the years;  
 I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways  
 Of my own mind; and in the mist of tears  
 I hid from Him, and under running laughter.  
     Up vistaed hopes I sped;  
     And shot, precipitated  
 Adown Titanic glooms of chasmed fears,  
 From those strong Feet that followed, followed after.  
     But with unhurrying chase,  
     And unperturbed pace,  
     Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,  
     They beat—and a Voice beat  
     More instant than the Feet,—  
 "All things betray thee, who betrayest Me."

I tempted all His servitors, but to find  
 My own betrayal in their constancy,  
 In faith to Him their fickleness to me,  
 Their traitorous trueness, and their loyal deceit.

To all swift things for swiftness I did sue ;  
 Clung to the whistling mane of every wind.  
 But whether they swept, smoothly fleet,  
 The long savannahs of the blue ;  
 Or whether, Thunder-driven,  
 They clang'd his chariot 'thwart a heaven,  
 Plashy with flying lightnings round the spurn o' their feet :—  
 Fear wist not to evade as Love wist to pursue.  
 Still with unhurrying chase,  
 And unperturb'd pace,  
 Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,  
 Came on the following Feet,  
 And a Voice above their beat—  
 "Naught shelters thee, who wilt not shelter Me."<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Thompson bespeaks our favour as the kinsman of two most highly gifted ladies, Mrs. Meynell and Lady Butler ; he wins it for himself by the fervour of his enthusiasm, the intense earnestness of his poetic and religious aspirations, by the promise of greater things for the future in the very extent and character of his lapses from perfection in the present. His next volume will be expected with no ordinary interest. He has secured the right to a favourable, a willing hearing ; and it will give sincere pleasure to all lovers of English literature if he can show that this goodwill has not been offered to him in vain.

So much and no more can we say after a review of the three most prominent among the younger poets of to-day. The promise of young poets is often unfulfilled, and therefore we are forbidden to be too confident. It may be that we have still many years to wait before a successor will be found for the throne of Tennyson. The great luminaries of the poetic heaven have set, and in the darkness we hear the question, again and again repeated, 'Watchman, what of the night ?' But the watchman, taking heed not to mistake even the brightest of the stars for the sun of heaven, can as yet answer nothing certain, except only the promise, 'The morning will come.'

<sup>1</sup> *Poems*, p. 48.

## ART. X.—RECENT WORKS ON EGYPT.

1. *The Dawn of Civilization*. By G. MASPERO. Edited by A. H. SAYCE. Translated by M. L. MCCLURE. London, 1894.
2. *Life in Ancient Egypt*. Described by ADOLF ERMAN. Translated by H. M. TIRARD. London, 1894.
3. *Egypt under the Pharaohs*. By HEINRICH BRUGSCH. A New Edition, condensed and thoroughly revised by M. BRODRICK. London, 1891.
4. *A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the XVth Dynasty*. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. London, 1894.

THAT three works upon Egyptology, of the scope and depth of Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization*, Erman's *Life in Ancient Egypt*, and Petrie's *History of Egypt*, should have been issued from three different publishing houses within a few weeks of each other, speaks volumes for the interest that is awakening in this country upon the subject of Egyptian Archaeology.

Hitherto, England as a nation has been conspicuous by the utter absence of interest she has displayed in all matters relating to the systematic study of Egyptology, to the rescue of Ancient Egyptian monuments, or to the recovery of historic sites in Egypt. There is hardly a European country of any note where, in one at least of their chief universities, may not be found a Chair of Egyptology, giving thorough instruction in all branches of that science. Notably is this the case in Paris and Berlin, where for years past there have been such successful schools under the guidance of Professors Maspero and Erman. Moreover, in Paris, besides the lectures of Maspero at the Collège de France, MM. Revillout and Pierret have for long taught in the school attached to the great national museum. In both these places the students receive their training free of all cost. In England the would-be student of Egyptology, needing help, has been obliged until lately to betake himself to Paris, Berlin, Geneva, or some other foreign university. Two years ago, owing to the munificence of the late Miss Amelia B. Edwards, who spent her life in the endeavour to awaken in the English mind an interest in all that concerned Ancient Egypt and its people, a Chair of Egyptology was founded at University College, London. The system of teaching which is there adopted shows that even now English professors are either far behind their foreign *confrères* in what they consider the requirements

of the student, or else that there are no *bona fide* students at present in this country. The academic year is from October until July. During this time the Professor is away in Egypt from the middle of November until May. Twelve lectures only are given during the session, and a class in hieroglyphs, lasting about an hour, is held once a week all through the year. The Edwards Library and Museum, while the Professor is in England, are open from ten till four, three days in the week, and those who know Dr. Petrie know also how able and willing he is to assist students. During his absence the library is opened but once a week. We have only to contrast the curriculum at Paris and Berlin with that of London to see at once the difference between the keen interest in the subject of Egyptology which is evinced in France and Germany and the lukewarmness with which it is regarded in England.

If, however, the systematic study of Egyptian Archaeology finds as yet but few ardent students in this country, there are signs all round of a very real and growing interest in it on the part of the British public generally. The increase in the number of people who annually visit Egypt, the demand for books upon the history of the country and people, and the intense anxiety lately displayed in the matter of the Philæ Reservoir, all point to the fact that the English have at last been aroused. When once they are fully awake students will doubtless be forthcoming; and, as a demand creates the supply, so we hope before long to see in one of the English universities a Chair of Egyptology, with a professor teaching there throughout the academic year.

England found it wise or necessary to establish a quasi protectorate in Egypt; her power there is to-day paramount; she is, we believe, the richest nation in the world, and considers herself the most intellectual. Yet, although by circumstances practically supreme in a land overflowing with records of the past, the Government of Great Britain has done little or nothing for the advancement of scientific research, the rescue of a well-nigh lost history, the care of priceless monuments, or the encouragement of students. True, most invaluable work has been done in Egypt during the past fifteen years, but it has been done by private enterprise alone; by the generosity of individuals, by the self-denying labours of men like Professor Petrie, and not by the nation.

The Egypt Exploration Fund and the Archaeological Survey, the Research Fund raised by Professor Petrie, and the Society for the Preservation of the Egyptian Monuments

are all working entirely through funds raised by private persons in England and America, and we believe these societies receive no recognition or assistance from the British Government. The work done by them is excellent, and has compelled attention. The apathetic British public, who at first regarded them as wild enthusiasts or harmless maniacs, is now gradually waking up to the fact that they are in deadly earnest, that the work they are doing is of real value and importance; and, in spite of itself, it must be interested too.

There is every reason why the excavations in Egypt should be assisted, and why the study of the archæological relics found there should receive encouragement and support. Was not Kamit (the black land) truly the mother of nations? Can any kingdom boast of such antiquity as does that of Egypt, whose authentic history reaches back about four thousand years before our era? In the Nile Valley sprang up a civilization unequalled by that of any pre-Christian nation. Literature and art flourished—unaided, we must remember, for about two thousand years, by any external influences. The wisdom and learning of the Egyptians were a proverb in the world; and Greek philosophers of old thought it not beneath their dignity to learn in the schools of Alexandria. To travel in Egypt both for instruction and amusement seems to have been as necessary to the Greek gentleman about the fourth century B.C. as it is to the English tourist to-day, and from Tacitus we learn that 'Germanicus set out for Egypt to study its antiquities.'<sup>1</sup> The connexion between the history of Egypt and the early history of the Hebrew nation must ever be full of interest to readers of the Hebrew Scriptures. How much do both theologians and lay people owe to the Egypt Exploration Fund for the recovery of Pithom, with its treasure chambers; of Zoan, once a royal residence, and probably the home of Joseph; of Pi-beseth; and of Tahpanhes, where, in spite of Jeremiah's remonstrances, Zedekiah's daughters insisted upon taking refuge? How completely Jeremiah's prophecy was fulfilled the charred walls and ruined heaps of the great palace-fortress attest.<sup>2</sup> In Christian times we find the new religion making its way in Egypt in very early days; and the second century saw a bishopric established in Alexandria, and the Copts—the Christian Egyptians—formulating a liturgy of their own (that of St. Mark), which claims to be one of the earliest.

<sup>1</sup> *Annals of Tacitus*, ii. 59.

<sup>2</sup> Jeremiah xlii. and xliii.

show  
Egy  
lish  
inte

earn  
so v  
that  
will  
this  
the

conc  
upon  
thou  
mod  
see  
hills

grou  
unde  
hear

Over  
'lan  
saki  
temp

scatt  
Wac  
the

next  
adm  
of th  
cove

givel  
flow  
tion

part  
says  
color

are t  
strea  
Islar  
Phil  
depic



These are but a few of the reasons why English people should be interested in the history and civilization of Ancient Egypt; and these reasons, combined with the books published recently upon the subject, we hope will stimulate the interest which appears to be at last aroused.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has earned our best thanks for publishing in an English edition so valuable a work as Maspero's *Les Origines*. It is enough that it bears his signature for us to know for certain that it will be scholarly, accurate, and thorough. How completely this is the case the arrangement of the book, as shown in the headings of the chapters, sets forth.

Professor Maspero first describes the original geological condition of the country, his statements being based chiefly upon Élie de Beaumont's *Leçons en Géologie*; and his writing, though scientific, is never dull. Then is given a picture of modern Egypt, which is drawn so vividly that we can almost see the glowing colours and deep shadows on the Libyan hills, the vivid green of the early crops in spring, and the groups of stately palms. We can almost feel the Nile winds under the Gebel Shêkh Herideh or the Gebel Abûfêda, and hear the roar of the cataract as it thunders down 'El Bab.' Over 'the granite threshold of Nubia' we are led into the 'land of croaking of frogs and the rhythmic creak of the sakiyeh' (water wheels), past the crumbling pylons of ruined temples, and rocks that are honeycombed with tombs, by scattered hamlets and groves of date and dôm palms on to Wady Halfah and the Second Cataract—the boundary of the kingdom of Ancient Egypt. The fauna and flora are next clearly and succinctly described, and then follows an admirable account of the traditions of the Nile. 'Hâpi, father of the gods, lord of sustenance, who maketh food to be, and covereth the two lands of Egypt with his products, who giveth life, banisheth want, and filleth the granaries to overflowing,'<sup>1</sup> was worshipped in Egypt with profound veneration from the very earliest times. He is represented as a partly male, partly female figure; and, as Professor Maspero says, 'is evolved into two personages, one being sometimes coloured red, and the other blue' (p. 37). His companions are two female deities, representing the fertile banks of the stream. The Nile was believed to have its source in the Island of Biggeh; and, in a small temple on the Island of Philæ, opposite, is a shrine, upon the walls of which are depicted in bas-relief the flowing forth of the waters of Hâpi

<sup>1</sup> Lepsius, *Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden*, &c., Plate XV. c.

(Nile) from a mysterious cavern, upon the top of which are perched the hawk and vulture, representing Lower and Upper Egypt.

The question of the origin of the ancient Egyptians is carefully discussed, and it may be well to compare here the different theories propounded by the authors of the four books under review. Maspero says :

‘The majority would place their cradle-land in Asia, but cannot agree in determining the route which was followed in the emigration to Africa. Some think that the people took the shortest road, across the Isthmus of Suez, others give them longer peregrinations and a more complicated itinerary. They would have them cross the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb and then the Abyssinian mountains, and spreading northward and keeping along the Nile, finally settle in the Egypt of to-day. A more minute examination compels us to recognize that the hypothesis of an Asiatic origin, however attractive it may seem, is somewhat difficult to maintain. The bulk of the Egyptian population presents the characteristics of those white races which have been found established from all antiquity on the Mediterranean slope of the Libyan continent. This population is of African origin, and came to Egypt from the west or south-west. In the valley it may have met with a black race which it drove back or destroyed ; and there, perhaps, too, it afterwards received an accretion of Asiatic elements introduced by way of the Isthmus and the marshes of the Delta. But whatever may be our theory with regard to the origin of the ancestors of the Egyptians, they were scarcely settled upon the banks of the Nile before the country conquered and assimilated them to itself, as it has never ceased to do in the case of strangers who have occupied it. At the time when their history begins for us, all the inhabitants had long formed but one people and had but one language’ (p. 45).

It is quite clear from the above quotation that Professor Maspero believes in the African origin of the Ancient Egyptians. He refers his readers to the works of various authors who have studied the question from an anthropological or ethnological point of view. Erman believes

‘that the inhabitants of Libya, Egypt, and Ethiopia have probably belonged to the same race since prehistoric times. In physical structure they are still Africans, though, in later times, they have adopted an Asiatic language.’

He then adds that

‘there is no necessity for a great immigration of the Egyptians from some distant corner of Asia. We may conscientiously believe them to be natives of their own country, children of their own soil, even if it should be proved that their old language, like their modern one, was imported from other countries’ (p. 32).

The learned German Professor deigns to give no authority for these statements. The general reader, as well as the student, ought to have assertions verified by reference to the authorities themselves.

Brugsch, although admitting that his theory is questioned by some of 'the younger school,' is distinctly of opinion that 'the forefathers of the Egyptians cannot be reckoned among the African races'; that the careful examination of the mummies, together with the conformation of the ancient skulls, indicate a connexion with the Caucasian family—the 'Cushite family' he prefers to call it, to distinguish it from the pure Semitic and Pelasgian stock:

'The cradle of the Egyptian people must be sought in the interior of the Asiatic quarter of the world. In the earliest ages of humanity, far beyond all historical remembrance, the Egyptians, for reasons unknown to us, left the soil of their primeval home, took their way towards the setting sun, and finally crossed that bridge of nations, the Isthmus of Suez, to find a new fatherland on the favoured banks of the sacred Nile' (p. 2).

Professor Petrie states boldly that he believes two or three different races to have occupied the country in the earliest historic times, which statement hardly coincides with Maspero's assertion that 'at the time when their history begins for us, all the inhabitants had long formed but one people' (p. 46). Professor Petrie bases his theory upon the three distinct types of face found upon the earliest monuments; and also upon the proofs he has found in his excavations of the co-existence of two entirely different forms of burial. This latter fact at once shows two different races. 'We have, then, probably,' he says, 'an indigenous race and an invading race; or, perhaps, even two invading races in succession, the large-eyed race preceding the aquiline' (p. 11). With regard to the nationality of the invading race, he comes to the conclusion that they 'may then be another branch of the Pūnite race, and their earliest immigration into Egypt confirms this' (p. 13). They clearly entered Egypt from the Red Sea coast and crossed by the Kosér-Koptos caravan route to This or Thinis, which tradition has ever maintained was the home of the first historic King of Egypt. Professor Petrie calls attention to various interesting facts resulting from his work at Koptos last season, the summing up of all of which appears to be that the ancient Egyptians we know so well from their monuments were not the aborigines of the country, that they migrated probably from the southern part of the Red Sea, and that if we accept the probability of the

Egyptians of historic times being Pūnites, we are led to the conclusion that they must be akin to the Phœnicians, and connected, not so very remotely, with the Philistines (pp. 11-16). Professor Petrie, on all questions of racial types, stands paramount, as he has made a special and very careful study of all that have been found in Egypt.<sup>1</sup> One significant fact in the discussion of this question should be kept in mind, and that is that all Egyptologists agree that the language, and the only language that has survived, of the ancient Egyptians is Semitic in its stock, and in no way derived from or related to the African families of speech.

To return to Maspero's book. The whole of the second chapter is devoted to the consideration of the innumerable gods and goddesses of Egypt, their special rôles, locations, &c., which consideration leads to an account of the reasons for mummifying the dead. The first thing that will strike the reader is that the Egyptians believed in such a confused medley of 'gods many and lords many,' deities of horns and hoofs, creatures of monstrous forms and ungodlike manners, that we wonder how there could be room for any religion at all among the inhabitants of the Nile Valley; and yet we know that they were in reality a truly pious nation. In early days, before magic and mystery played so conspicuous a part in their religious observances, we find that theirs was a faith closely akin to Monotheism; that underneath all the accretions of a symbolism which had in great part lost its meaning, and even failed to convey sense, there was once a belief in one God and Him supreme. But for this Professor Maspero hardly gives them credit, nor does he, to our mind, sufficiently emphasize the fact that at different periods of time different gods were in vogue—that, in fact, the religion of Egypt was not 'one religion' but a whole family of religions, and that these religions did not stultify each other but were even contemporaneous. The dogmas of one school might be exactly opposite to those of another; but for all that they were held without let or hindrance, and full religious liberty was enjoyed by all the subjects of the Egyptian State. It must also be borne in mind that Maspero's account of the gods and the so-called religion of Egypt is far from being in accord with that of the great German scholar, Heinrich Brugsch, who has made this subject his special study.<sup>2</sup> One very interesting point is emphasized, and that is, that the creation of the world was not by effort nor by evolution; but by the *voice* of

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Racial Portraits*.

<sup>2</sup> H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der alten Aegypten*.

Thot  
artic  
poten  
from  
stand  
creat  
this v  
it wa  
Let t  
of G  
form  
lation  
consi  
incan  
voice  
(pp. 1  
of Eg  
befor  
*maât*  
the s  
true  
essen  
those  
the s  
conce  
descr  
the s  
and f  
good.  
given  
Le P  
stantl  
signif  
who s  
'T  
but "I  
the do  
They  
him. .  
TI  
strain  
<sup>1</sup> E  
Plate I  
<sup>2</sup> P  
Champ  
VOL

Thoth. It was the result of a command—a word: 'The articulate word and the voice were believed to be the most potent of creative forces, not remaining immaterial on issuing from the lips, but thickening, so to speak, into tangible substances; into bodies which were themselves animated by creative life and energy' (p. 146). It is interesting to contrast this with the Hebrew account of Creation: 'God spake, and it was done, He commanded, and it stood fast; 'God said, Let there be light,' &c. In fact, the whole of the first chapter of Genesis is one reiterated 'God said.' The very important formula *maât kheru*, which is rendered in the English translation as the 'true intonation' (*véridique*), or 'true of voice,' is considered by Maspero to apply to the magic words and incantations, which, being recited in the conventional tone of voice, should render the speaker a 'master of the universe' (pp. 146, 182, 213). Now, Mr. Le Page Renouf, the Nestor of Egyptologists, has demonstrated (in a learned paper read before the Society of Biblical Archæology in March 1892) that *maât kheru* has the sense of 'victorious, triumphant'—that the sense of *véridique* is untenable. He contends that its true signification is 'one whose voice is law,' and that it is essentially a *divine* title. It is applied only to the dead, to those who had become Osirians. To use the word *maât* in the sense of 'true' is to limit it to one of its secondary conceptions. *Maât* is essentially law, order. An admirable description is given of the judgment of the Osirian soul before the shrine of Osiris, lord of the under world; the illustrations and footnotes to this portion of the book being particularly good. One more note, however, we should like to have seen given, and that is a reference to the suggestion made by Mr. Le Page Renouf concerning the cynocephali who are constantly seen accompanying the bark of the sun. *Aânu* signifies 'to salute'; *aânu*, 'the saluter,' is the cynocephalus who salutes the rising sun.<sup>1</sup>

'The "saluters" of the rising sun are neither real apes nor men, but "the Spirits of the East" who effect the rising of Ra by opening the door at each of the four portals of the eastern horizon of heaven. They it is who light him on both sides, and go forth in advance of him. . . . And when he arises they turn into six cynocephali.'<sup>2</sup>

The magicians, with their spells, and their powers to constrain, 'even at a distance, the wills of men,' and to produce

<sup>1</sup> E. Naville, *Todtenbuch*, I, Plates XXI. XXII.; *Papyrus of Ani*, Plate II.

<sup>2</sup> *Proceedings of the Soc. Bib. Arch.* April 1892. Tomb of Rameses VI. Champollion's *Notices*, tome ii. p. 640.

diseases, seem to have been indeed a formidable body. Evil spirits also took possession of men and women, and, even when they ceased to torment their victims, left behind in brain, nerve, or body the traces of their fell visit. It was therefore necessary that remedies should be resorted to which should restore the enfeebled health: needless to say, these remedies are largely mixed up with magic. Hence Thoth, the great magician, was also the first physician. According to Herodotos (ii. 84), doctors abounded in Egypt, and the practice of medicine was divided among specialists. The *Berlin Medical Papyrus* and the *Ebers Papyrus* are the two most important of the five works on 'the principles and practice of medicine' which have come down to us, and from the prescriptions contained in them we may indeed feel thankful to have escaped the clutches of the medical faculty in ancient Egypt. Diseases of the eyes, gastric fever, epilepsy, and anæmia were as common in those days as now; and the remedies used for their cure were often most complicated and very horrible. Their knowledge of anatomy and of man's internal economy was extremely vague. 'Life seemed to be a little air—a breath which was conveyed by the veins from member to member' (p. 216). The *Ebers Papyrus*, which describes the construction of the human body, tells us that the head contains twenty-two vessels, which draw the spirits into it and send them hence to all parts of the body. There are two vessels for the breasts, which communicate heat to the lower parts. There are two vessels for the thighs, two for the neck, two for the arms, two for the back of the head, two for the forehead, two for the eyes, two for the eyelids, two for the right ear, by which enter the breaths of life, the good airs, the delicious airs of the north, and two for the left ear, which in like manner admit the breaths of death.<sup>1</sup> The heart was looked upon as the motive power of the whole body; and the Egyptian physicians seem to have had at least an inkling of the circulation of the blood. Death was the withdrawal from the body of the 'breaths' or 'vital spirits,' accompanied by the soul. Religious scruples prevented the Egyptian physicians from performing surgical operations upon the living subject, or dissecting the dead. This will account for their ignorance of anatomy.

The fourth chapter of the *Dawn of Civilization* is quite the best in the whole of this first-rate work. In it the author enters very fully into the constitution of Egyptian society, the power of the king, the arrangement of the complicated priest-

<sup>1</sup> *Ebers Papyrus* (Berlin, 1890), Pl. XCIX. l. i.-c. l. 14.



hood, and feudalism as it existed in Egypt in those days. Besides this, he gives an admirable account of the life of the people, together with a description of their different kinds of tombs. The literary style is clear and vigorous, bringing the whole subject before the reader most vividly. Even were this not the case, the illustrations alone would redeem the book from any accusation of dulness or ambiguity. It is not the least of Professor Maspero's many gifts that he has a wonderful power of imparting knowledge, both orally and by writing, as all who have had the privilege of being his students know well. The illustrations with which he has lavishly enriched this, his *magnum opus*, are really superb, and no pains have been spared in finding and reproducing subjects which will bear upon the letterpress. The author has not been satisfied with using again illustrations which, good as they may be, are already well known, but he has given practically an entirely new set. Nor has he been content merely to insert the reproduction of photographs, which, though always accurate, frequently come out blurred, as may be seen in the illustrations to Professor Petrie's *History of Egypt* (pp. 14, 26, 62, 77). The whole of the illustrations for this great work have been drawn by MM. Faucher-Gudin and Boudier, two first-rate draughtsmen, and have thus added the taste and skill of the artists to the accuracy of the camera.

In alluding to the Sphinx, Professor Maspero places the date of it previous to the Third Dynasty, an opinion held by most Egyptologists. From this Dr. Petrie dissents; he considers there is evidence against it. He further makes the sweeping assertion 'that no tombs at Gizeh are older than Khufu, nor are any in this part of the cemetery older than Khafra'; he queries the knowledge by Thothmes IV. of Khafra, and repudiates his veneration for him. He also states that 'there is no figure or mention of the Sphinx itself on a single monument of the old kingdom' (p. 52). He gives neither reasons for nor proofs of any of these assertions. Professor Petrie further says: 'In the middle of the back is an old shaft; such would certainly not be made at a time when it was venerated, and it must belong to some tomb which was made here before the Sphinx was carved' (p. 52). The English is very difficult to follow; Professor Petrie, we conclude, means the '*it*' to relate to the Sphinx, and neither to 'the back' nor 'the shaft.' If he means that a tomb shaft has been sunk through the back of the Sphinx, surely the Sphinx and not the tomb must be the older of the two monuments. On the next page (53) he asserts that 'the back and

lower part of the sides have never been examined'; that being the case, then, how does the Professor know that there is an old tomb shaft in its back? It is a fact worth remarking that, whereas the Pharaohs never scrupled to appropriate their predecessors' monuments by cutting their cartouches upon them, or, as in Sneferu's temple at Medum, to record their visits to sacred places upon them, the Sphinx, so far as we know, has escaped entirely from these inscribed records. Even Rameses II., who was utterly unscrupulous in chiselling out his predecessors' names and putting his own everywhere, has not dared to touch the Sphinx. Perchance the sacred image of Hor-em-Khu was too deeply venerated for even so powerful and arbitrary a monarch to touch it: or maybe it was older far than the Pyramids, a relic of the days of the first Egyptian immigrants, and as such had gathered around itself such an array of traditions that no one, not even Pharaoh himself, dare lay a finger upon it. No actual proof either one way or the other of the date when the Sphinx was constructed can be given until that monument has been thoroughly excavated—a work which would well repay the excavator, from both an historical and a chronological point of view. The western desert all round the Sphinx is one vast necropolis, where, from the earliest ages, the dead were laid to rest each in his 'eternal habitation'—the kings in their Pyramids, the wealthy people in their 'mastabas,' and the poorer members of the community in roughly-built tombs of yellow sun-dried bricks, vaulted over. As a rule, the tombs 'are oriented to the four cardinal points, the greatest axis being directed north and south; but the masons seldom troubled themselves to find the true north, and the orientation is usually incorrect' (p. 250). This, of course, may have been the case; but is it not also possible that the time of the year and position of the sun, or Sothis, may account for the variation from the true cardinal points? Every tomb contained an oblong chamber known technically as 'the chapel,' in which have always been found a stela—a stone or wooden tablet, on which are inscribed the name and titles of the deceased, and the *proskynema* to Osiris or Anpu—and a table of offerings, sometimes flanked by two small obelisks or two small altars. A portrait statue of the deceased was also sometimes placed within a recess made in the thickness of the wall. According to the wealth of the owner, the walls of 'the chapel' were more or less decorated, and were covered with scenes—mostly agricultural, under the old kingdom—with explanatory hieroglyphs. Liturgies for the dead, which were provided for from the produce of lands bequeathed to the priests for

that purpose, were said at certain seasons of the year. There was no coinage in Egypt; all payments were made in kind. Far below the ground, at the bottom of a shaft, sunk at a depth varying from forty to a hundred feet, in the corner or middle of the chapel, was the sepulchral chamber. In this was laid the sarcophagus, hewn out of granite, basalt, or limestone; it was often devoid both of ornamentation and inscription. The mummy, having been placed in its stone coffin, with the slaughtered ox, phials of perfume, and jars of water beside it, the workmen then walled up the entrance to the chamber, and filled the shaft with stone chips, gravel, rubble, &c., which, being well watered, hardened into a firm, concrete-like substance. This was to prevent all possibility of violating the 'eternal habitation' of the deceased. Professor Maspero points out that running through these tomb-scenes and inscriptions may ever be seen, towering above all others, the figure of the reigning monarch.

There never was a nation who worshipped kingly power as did the old Egyptians; and the 'divine right of kings' existed as far back as Pyramid times. The king was the representation of divinity upon earth; therefore the king could do no wrong. Nay more, he was part of the divinity himself, and was regarded by the people as nothing less than a god. He was 'Se Ra,' Son of Ra, 'mer en Ra,' Beloved of Ra, 'ankh t'etta,' Living for ever. To his own personal or family name he added, at his accession, a surname or throne-name, into which was incorporated some allusion to his divine genealogy. Besides that, the king had a Horus or banner-name, indicative of that special designation of the *ka* or double of Horus, which became his at his coming to the throne. This last name is 'usually written in an oblong rectangle, terminated at the lower end by a number of lines portraying in a summary way the façade of a monument, in the centre of which a bolted door may sometimes be distinguished; this is the representation of the chapel where the double will one day rest, and the closed door is the portal of the tomb' (p. 261). Professor Maspero, in his footnote upon the meaning of the sign in which the Horus name is enclosed, quotes and agrees with Petrie's views upon the subject; he cannot be aware that Mr. Le Page Renouf, in the *Proceedings of the Soc. Bib. Arch.* November 3, 1891, p. 17, completely demolishes, upon philological grounds, the theory put forward by Professor Petrie. Being, then, possessed of a double nature—one divine and one human—Pharaoh was of necessity more fitted than mere humanity alone would be to

approach the gods. He was therefore the high priest *par excellence*. He is depicted as making the offerings of milk, wine or oil ; as slaughtering the sacrificial bull, pouring out the libations, taking part in the solemn processions of the symbols of the gods. He it was who, by right of his supernatural kinship with divinity, was the mediator between deity and humanity, and thus kept his people in touch as it were with the gods. With him the gods held personal intercourse ; laying their commands upon him, dissuading him from or encouraging him to perform contemplated actions, foretelling what was in store for him, and bidding him convey their communications to priests or people. Sometimes this was done by means of dreams ; at others the king, questioning the image or symbol of the divinity, would receive an answer from the priest as the interpreter of the divine wishes. The queen—the ‘ great spouse ’—was nearly always of royal blood, and was therefore ‘ a daughter of Ra.’ By her marriage with the god-king she became a goddess ; and as such various important duties, chiefly of a priestly character, devolved upon her. A lucid description is given of a royal residence, with all the servants and officials attached to it ; and our only wonder is that with the scores of barbers and hairdressers, keepers of linen, and attendants on the royal nails, perfumers and laundresses, Pharaoh ever had any of his most ordinary needs supplied. There were soldiers and sailors to guard his royal and divine person, chaplains to administer to the ills of his mind, and physicians for the cure of the weaknesses of his body ; added to whom appear to have been a rabble of unshod courtiers, who did nothing industriously, and fed at his Majesty’s expense. From Court life the author passes on to the home life of the people, illustrated with capital pictures of houses, a ground plan of a Twelfth Dynasty town found at Gurob, scenes in a bazaar, a harvest scene, and a most interesting sketch of a mural painting found by Professor Petrie in the ruins of an ancient house at Kahun (Twelfth Dynasty).

The remaining chapters of the *Dawn of Civilization* give a description of the different Pyramids, in which is included the latest information obtained from that at Dahshur ; and a learned and exhaustive account of the history of Ancient Egypt until the close of the Middle Empire. We can only hope that Professor Maspero will see his way to publish before long a continuation of this splendid but unfinished work. We hardly know what most to admire, the marvellous erudition of the Professor, or his faculty for being able to

condense his knowledge and put it into such an interesting and simple form. His book is invaluable alike to the student or the general reader. The failings of the *Dawn of Civilization* rest with the translator and the publishers. The former has by the preface made herself responsible for the index; and we are bound to admit that it is, without exception, the worst from which we have ever tried to work. Every book with any pretensions to usefulness should have an index; and for students this is an absolute necessity. A bad index is, however, worse than none at all, as any reader endeavouring to make use of this one will find to his cost. Within a given portion of the body of this work there are sixteen subjects mentioned at length, not one of which can be found in the index. Moreover, Mrs. McClure seems uncertain as to whether medicaments are put together from a recipe or a receipt (*sic*) (p. 218, note 1; p. 220, note 1); probably she will have found out by the time the second edition is called for. Mr. Fraser's name is also spelt wrongly wherever he is mentioned; this is a needless blunder, as he was for some time in the employ of a society of which Mrs. McClure is a member of committee. The great weight of the book will, we fear, detract from its usefulness—it is unfortunate that the publishers could not see their way to dividing it into two volumes. To hold a book weighing nearly six pounds for any length of time will dissipate the energies of any one but an enthusiast. Also we wish that the number of the chapters had been added to the heading of the pages. While the paper and binding are so good, it is a pity that the print is not better. Either the printers have but an indifferent press reader, or else their fount of type stands sadly in need of renewal. The quantity of broken letters all through the book makes it very tiresome reading. Many of the words are also set quite crookedly, and some pages are badly smudged, notably pages 235, 534. The printing of the book betokens haste or carelessness. All these are but details, and details that can be remedied in the second edition, which we feel sure will be required before long; but Professor Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization* is so essentially first-rate throughout that it is a pity to detract from its value by obvious carelessness in matters of detail.

A more unfortunate time than the present could hardly have been chosen for the production of an English edition of Professor Erman's *Aegypten*. Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization*, with its magnificent illustrations and complete 'up to date-ness,' cannot fail to prove superior to a work written ten years

ago, which has not been corrected to our present state of Egyptological knowledge. Mrs. Tirard asserts that Gardiner Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* has long ago become obsolete, so far as the letterpress is concerned (p. 5). This statement may to a certain extent be true; but, even if it be wholly so, Professor Erman's work is hardly calculated to fill the place of that popular and most useful book. Moreover, the learned author's work will on certain points be considered by many scholars to be itself 'obsolete.'

Erman, feeling that there did not exist in German any popular account of the manners and customs in Ancient Egypt, and realizing that an inexpensive book on the subject would probably be widely read, published in 1885 the *Aegypten*. In order to lessen the cost of production, he made use of illustrations already known, and drew very largely from Gardiner Wilkinson, the *Denkmäler*, and *L'Histoire de l'Art*, by Perrot and Chipiez. No doubt this was an excellent plan, so far as the Germans were concerned; but readers in England have so long been familiar with these illustrations, and, in the case of Gardiner Wilkinson, and Perrot and Chipiez, so many people already possess their works that a book containing reproductions of the same illustrations is hardly needed; and certainly not at a time when Professor Maspero has put forth a work containing hitherto unknown drawings and photographs. Good as Professor Erman's book is, it can hardly be called 'interesting.' It is too full of detail, and of matters which are quite out of place in a popular work, but which are invaluable in a text book or book for reference. The very pedantic method of transliterating the hieroglyphic signs is quite unnecessary, and only gives the reader gratuitous trouble. Where Professor Erman's *Aegypten* is likely to prove useful is in the interesting information he has gathered together and translated from the hieratic papyri. He has drawn very largely from these sources, and has given some admirable renderings from them—the *Select Papyri* in the British Museum having proved specially useful for this purpose.

There is a very charming account of the land of Egypt given as a sort of introduction to the people and their modes of living, though we are not quite of Professor Erman's opinion that the 'landscape is not calculated to awaken the inspiration of the soul,' and that 'the Egyptian grew up under conditions unfavourable to the development of his spiritual life.' Possibly, like so many Germans, the Professor



may have the misfortune to be short-sighted, and thus cannot see colour, or he may be quite destitute of any feeling for it. The land of Egypt is full of colour—and ever changing colour—from sunrise to sunset. Whether it be the cultivated land, or the desert, or the hills, they are aglow with exquisite lights and shades and half tones, and with that wonderful clearness of outline which is so impossible to paint without ‘hardness.’ The exquisite beauty of the Egyptian colouring, when the first surprise and delight of the traveller have passed away, is certainly calculated to awaken a slumbering soul, and to enflame even the faintest spark of the poetic faculty. We can hardly agree with the statement that the undisturbed, reposeful way in which life was passed in Ancient Egypt was not good for the nation. It is to that fact chiefly that we owe those wonderful tombs from which we have learned the life history, the art, and the literature of the oldest of nations. The ‘influence of a great national war’ may be invigorating to the brute force of the nation, but it is not necessary to the inspiration of the poet, the painter, or the writer; nor is it particularly favourable to the development of the spiritual life (pp. 15, 16).

A very full account is given of the family life of the people. They were essentially home loving; and although the actual fabric of their houses must have been of perishable material, yet they adorned their homes most artistically, and delighted in surrounding themselves with objects of beautiful shape and workmanship, and of delicate colouring. As a rule the Egyptian gentleman liked to live away from the noise and bustle of a village or town, and to seclude himself and his family from the eyes of the curious. Consequently we find most of the houses were surrounded by gardens planted with trees and shut in by high crenellated walls. Until the time of the so-called New Empire (Eighteenth Dynasty) the houses appear to have been small for their requirements; but this may be accounted for by the mildness of the climate, which permitted of an entirely out-of-door life. Of their furniture many precious relics have survived. Comfortable couches with cushions, elegant chairs and stools, may be seen quite as often in an Egyptian home in 1895 B.C. as in an English one in 1895 A.D.; and floral decorations were *de rigueur* in every household. ‘Wreaths of flowers for the wine-jars were indispensable, and when the Court travelled through a town it was just as necessary that the servants should procure the 100 wreaths as the 29,200 loaves or the 200 bushels of coal’ (*An. Pap.* 4, 14, 6). No dinner party was complete without an

abundance of flowers, even the guests being decorated with wreaths of sweet-smelling buds. This great love of flowers is a characteristic of the old Egyptians. They cultivated them to a considerable extent, and with the utmost care; and his garden was the pride of the gentleman of bygone days. Flowers—especially those of the lotus—were placed with the dead. When Professor Maspero opened the coffin of Amen-hetep I., found at Deir-el-Bahari in 1881, the mummy was literally buried under garlands of them. So beautifully had they been preserved that neither colour nor form had suffered, though of course they rapidly fell to pieces on exposure to the air. However, it has been quite possible to identify many of the plants used for the royal burial, the chief ones being two kinds of lotus flowers, willow and mimosa leaves, acacia flowers and fruit, and the beautiful *Delphinium orientale* with its brilliant violet petals. The kings themselves did not by any means disdain the gentle art of gardening.

Many years after Amen-hetep I. had been laid to rest in his flower-filled coffin, Queen Hatshepset (or Chnemtamun, as Professor Erman prefers to call her) sent an expedition to the 'blessed land' of Punt, and brought thence thirty-one 'growing incense trees' to plant in the neighbourhood of Karnak.<sup>1</sup> Later on in history, Rameses III., following his predecessor's example, again tried the experiment of transplanting these shrubs to adorn the court of the sanctuary of Amen in Apt.<sup>2</sup> Besides their love of gardening, the Egyptians seem to have had a great affection for keeping animals of different kinds, and trying to tame them. With the body of one princess was found the mummy of her little pet gazelle, which had been placed beside her to accompany her to 'the Divine, hidden land.' Thothmes III.'s love of natural history was so great that we read that 'four unknown birds gave him greater pleasure than the war contribution of a whole country.'<sup>3</sup> Rameses II., of the Nineteenth Dynasty, went out to fight the Kheta with his tame lion at his chariot wheels; and at night the animal lay down outside his master's tent. Dogs were then as now man's most frequent four-footed companions, and the Sudanese hounds called Slughis were the most fashionable. A courtier of King Khafra had, we learn, two long-maned baboons, and when he and his wife went out to overlook their workmen the baboons went likewise.<sup>4</sup> Small monkeys also were very common pets, and representations of

<sup>1</sup> *Düm. Hist. MS.* ii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Harris Pap.* i. 7, 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, p. 168.

<sup>4</sup> *Denkmäler*, ii. 13, 107.

them, as their masters' companions, may frequently be seen upon the tomb walls. We are not surprised after this to find that the Egyptians were also keen sportsmen; and many a king of the Ancient Empire (Dynasties I.-VI.) had his 'master of the hunt.' Lion hunting in the desert seems to have been a very favourite pastime; and one king is reported to have slain 110 lions with his own hand. Antelope and gazelle hunting were also very much in vogue. The Egyptians preferred chasing game with a pack of dogs, and then capturing it with a bolas or lasso, to shooting it. Fowling in the marshes with decoy birds and a throw-stick was another common form of sport, and very suitable to country like the Delta. They fished with a line and also with nets; moreover, in some cases they practised fish spearing with an instrument strangely like a modern pitchfork. In ancient days the hippopotamus had his home in the valley of the Nile, and the pursuit of him was attended with the excitement of considerable danger. He has long ceased to frequent the canals and marshes both of the Delta and Upper Egypt, and is now never seen north of Nubia.<sup>1</sup> From the earliest times Egyptian women danced, and even in the Fourth Dynasty we find named figure-dances already in existence. It is an essentially Oriental form of amusement, and enters into all the occasions of life, both grave and gay. An Egyptian entertainment in olden times would not have been considered complete without the dancing women any more than it would nowadays.

It is, in our opinion, a matter for regret that Professor Erman could not see his way to making foot-notes which would have brought those portions of his work which are antiquated up to the level of our present knowledge. If pressure of work and consequent lack of time prevented him from so doing, we feel sure that Mrs. Tirard would have been both able and willing to undertake the task.

Two faults we have to find with this otherwise carefully constructed book. There is no list of illustrations—a complaint we must also make against Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization*—and there is no table of hieroglyphic equivalents. This last ought to be considered as an absolute essential of every book published upon Ancient Egypt, until scholars shall come to some agreement as to transliteration. We are quite sure that many an English reader will not recognize in some of the extraordinary looking words names with which he is really

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Tirard has written 'south of Nubia,' which we feel sure must be a slip of the pen, p. 12.

quite familiar. Erman's system is to reduce all words to consonants and commas, thus, 'j', 'š', *wn*, *dpw*, 'nh, &c., a system which may have the merit of being very scientific, but can by no possibility convey either sound or sense to any but a German mind. Maspero, on the other hand, transliterates upon a system of elaborate vocalization, which, though pronounceable, is not very intelligible; e.g. Ouopouatou, Shothphitri, Hatshopsitou, &c. To take the familiar name of Thothmes, with which every one is probably acquainted, the following variations are those which are in use: Dhutmose, Thothmosis, Thutmosis, Tehuti-mes, Tahutmes, and Dehuti-mes. One great mistake has been made by the translator all through the book; she has fallen into that very old trap of trying to make the *Ch* act as the representative of the guttural sound. This, by the construction of the English language, will not invariably answer; we feel certain that any one coming to the word *Chetas* or *Chafre* for the first time will pronounce them as if the *ch* were soft, as in *church*; *kh* needs must be the nearest equivalent of the hard guttural sound, for the present at any rate. Modern Egyptian names are not always correctly written either, e.g. *Feyum* and *Zawijet*.

We are very glad to welcome from the house of Murray a new edition of Heinrich Brugsch's *Egypt under the Pharaohs*. This, we believe, makes the third edition to which that valuable history has run in England. Brugsch published the original work in 1877 under the title of *Geschichte Aegyptens unter den Pharaonen*, but he took care to explain that it was in no way intended to be an elaborately worked-out history of Dynastic Egypt. It only represented all the information from the actual monuments (*Denkmäler*) themselves that he had been able to obtain, and this information, without any attempt at literary style, he strung together chronologically. The book cannot therefore be judged from the point of view of a literary work of art. It must stand or fall by the accuracy of its statements.

The second English edition appears to have satisfied the learned author completely, but as a translation it leaves very much to be desired. It is so literal that it is most wearisome, and the student has often to wade through a dreary waste of many-lined sentences before he reaches the verb. It is German translated literally into English—not an English translation of a German book; and the translator is frequently not very happy in his choice of words—as, for instance, when he speaks of the *holy* (*heilige*) Nile when the *Sacred* river is

meant. Moreover, the translator, not content with presenting the great German Professor's history to the English public in its simplicity, has for reasons best known to himself found it necessary to interlard nearly every page with notes 'of his own composing;' which generally are by no means to the point. He also frequently quotes from Mr. Villiers Stuart, which is unfortunate; for although the illustrations contained in that author's work are very fine, Egyptologists cannot but agree that Egyptology as a science is not his strong point.

These notes, together with Professor Brugsch's paper on 'The Exodus and the Egyptian Monuments' (which theory was of great interest at the moment, but has since been entirely exploded), increased the size of the original work to two bulky volumes. Mr. Murray, realizing the awakening interest in Egyptian matters on the part of English people generally, resolved to re cast the book; and while placing it before the public in a more portable form, he was most anxious to bring the history fully up to date and only to eliminate such portions of the work as were not of vital necessity or importance. The whole has, therefore, been carefully revised and condensed, and sundry small additions have been made, deemed by the publishers advisable. Not the least improvement has been the entire re-setting of the maps, which are now admirable. There is also a topographical map as a frontispiece, on which are given the principal Dynasties of the Pharaonic kings, by the side of the towns from which their respective dynasties were named. This is invaluable both to the student and the general reader. Had this book not been published before Major Hanbury-Brown brought out his *Fayûm and Lake Mæris*, Miss Brodrick would doubtless have corrected the statement that Linant-Bey 'has proved that it [Lake Mæris] lay in the south-eastern part of the Fayûm.' The work of Major Brown and of Professor Petrie<sup>1</sup> in the province of the Fayûm has quite upset this theory. These two specialists seem to agree in considering that Lake Mæris covered almost the entire province, and that not until the time of Amen-em-hat III. was the lake actually turned into an artificial reservoir for the Nile water, and much of the land reclaimed and protected by dykes. Professor Maspero<sup>2</sup> takes a more moderate view when, in speaking of the Birket-Kerun—the Arab name for the Fayûm Lake—he says: 'The lake formerly extended beyond its present limits, and submerged districts from which it has since

<sup>1</sup> *Hawara, Biahmû, and Arsinoë.*

<sup>2</sup> *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 446.

withdrawn.' Whatever may have been the exact extent of the reservoir, and however much land may have been reclaimed, it must be admitted that for so early a time in the world's history—*circa* 2300 B.C.—it was a most remarkable engineering enterprise.

Professor Brugsch speaks of Queen Hatshepset as the sister and wife of Thothmes II. This must surely be a slip of the pen, and it is a mistake which ought to have been rectified with a foot-note. It is quite clear that Thothmes II. was her half-brother only, being a son of Thothmes I. and Mautnefert, a lady of inferior rank,<sup>1</sup> while Thothmes III., also described as her brother, was the son of Thothmes I. by the Lady Ast.<sup>2</sup> Hatshepset, the daughter of Thothmes I. and the Queen Ahmes Nefertari, became, therefore, in her own right, Queen of Egypt; and this Professor Brugsch entirely ignores when he says that she 'risked everything to get the government into her own hands.' Her father had associated her with him on the throne before his death—a fact which is recorded in an historical inscription sculptured upon one of the pylons of the Temple of Karnak. It has been translated with commentary by E. de Rougé in his '*Etudes du Massif de Karnak*' in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie*, i. 50. In the table on page 127 of the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty and their wives, no indication is given that the Hatshepsu-Meri-Ra, who was the wife of Thothmes III., was the daughter of Queen Hatshepset. This marriage was probably effected by the policy of the queen, whose care in thus legitimatizing the future reign of Thothmes III. was little appreciated by the brother who, on his accession, showed his contempt for the old conservative idea of inheritance through a royal mother, by erasing the name of his sister from several of her monuments. For, since the queen had no son, according to Egyptian custom, her daughter's husband would be the next Pharaoh. We think that Professor Brugsch is also a little unwilling to acknowledge the importance of this old Egyptian law when he says:

'In the meantime Tehuti-mes grew up to manhood, and according to the Egyptian law claimed a share in the throne, which his sister could not withhold from him; and, yielding to force, she placed beside her on the throne, as associate king, the rightful heir to the crown and lineal representative of the royal house' (p. 149).

Nor do we think that Tehuti-mes III. had any right to have

<sup>1</sup> *Le Musée Egyptien*, by E. Grébaut, pt. i., and an Article by Maspero in the *Revue Critique*, December 1890, No. 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Momies Royales de Deir-el-Bahari*, pt. i. p. 548.



'deep rancour in his heart' when he 'assumed the royal dignity' (p. 149).

This seventh chapter is one of the most interesting in the book. The account of the expedition sent by the queen to the sacred land of Punt, in search of the precious incense which played so important a part in the temple services, is most vivid. Whether it was the desire of the queen for glory, or a wish to do something unprecedented for the service of the god Amen, or a natural curiosity of mind which delighted in the acquirement of strange and rare objects—a trait we observe in her half-brother Thothmes III.—that caused her to equip and send out this expedition, she succeeded in accomplishing her end. On the walls of the Stage Temple at Deir-el-Bahari is fully set forth in a series of bas-relief, coloured pictures, and well-cut inscriptions, the story of this voyage of discovery. First we find the forming of the fleet, and the loading of the ships with gifts for the foreign princes.

'A royal ambassador accompanied the expedition, with many noble princes and lords. How long the voyage lasted the inscriptions do not state. When the fleet had reached its destination, a landing was made on the coast of the "incense terraced-mountain" near Cape Guardafui' (p. 144).

Then follow most interesting pictures of these strange people and their dwellings. These latter were dome-shaped huts built on piles and entered by a ladder. They are overshadowed by fruit-laden cocoa nut and palm trees. The accuracy of the artist is shown in the drawing of the foreign birds, of which there are represented species not known in Egypt. To meet the strange arrivals come the Prince of Punt, his enormously fat wife—followed by the little ass which has carried her—his two sons, his daughter, and their suite. They express great surprise at the marvellous journey of the Egyptians, and speak very politely of Egypt's god Amen-Ra, and of Egypt's queen. Apparently the prince assents to the demand of the ambassador that the country of Punt should become tributary to Egypt, and should send back with the fleet a quantity of incense, and other produce of the land desired by the queen. For we next see that the ambassador has landed and pitched his camp on the shore. To quote one of the temple inscriptions given,

'The camp of tents of the royal ambassador and his warriors was pitched in the neighbourhood of the balsam terraced-mountain of the country of Punt, on the shore of the great sea, to receive the princes of this country. There were offered to them bread, meat,

wine, dried fruits, and everything else from the country of Tamera (Egypt), just as the royal court had ordered' (p. 145).

A great quantity of tribute is then brought: golden rings, ivory, precious woods, heaps of resin of incense, ebony, paint for the eyes, dog-headed apes, long-tailed monkeys, greyhounds, leopard-skins; and not least interesting are the young incense trees which, taken to Egypt, formed the first garden of acclimatization of which we have any record.

The account of all this, and of the grand ceremony on the return of the fleet, is most pleasantly written, with frequent quotations from the inscriptions accompanying the pictures at Deir-el-Bahari. Here it is quite clear where all the inscriptions quoted from are to be found. This is not invariably the case throughout the book. 'In another inscription of the time of Ramses II.' is tantalizingly vague to the student. But this is a fault we can rarely find with Brugsch's *Egypt under the Pharaohs*.

The account of the reign of Rameses II. is very well done, the innumerable monuments of this period being allowed to speak through their inscriptions. How far it is safe to rely on records engraved by the command of a monarch whom we have discovered to have been a by no means high-minded man, it is difficult to decide. The obvious exaggerations in parts of the *Poem of Pentaur*, in which is graphically described the great war of Rameses II. against the Kheta, or Hittites, and their allies, seem to throw a doubt on the more moderate statements. But Professor Brugsch is only carrying out his avowed intention of letting the monuments tell their own tale when he gives a translation of the whole of the heroic *Poem of Pentaur*.

A short chapter has been added, giving an account of the 'find' of royal mummies at Deir-el-Bahari, which was an event of such importance as in itself to warrant, if not necessitate, a new edition of the *History*. Notice has also been taken of the discovery of a large collection of mummies belonging to the College of Priests and Priestesses of Amen. One hundred and sixty-three bodies were found in 1892 in the neighbourhood of Deir-el-Bahari, which, when first discovered, were in a condition of well-nigh hopeless confusion.

'Sarcophagi, baskets containing funeral wreaths, statuettes, boxes, funerary offerings, and small cases crammed with papyri, all lay about, as if hurriedly thrust away for purposes of concealment. Some of the sarcophagi bore the date of the Eleventh Dynasty, and it was for a few hours fondly hoped that the explorers might have come upon an unbroken sequence of the high priests from that period

onwards. But the majority of the 163 mummies appear to belong to the Twenty-first Dynasty, and though called "high priests of Amen," are thought to be the corpses of generals and other dignitaries who bore priestly as well as official titles' (p. 363).

The *History of Egypt under the Pharaohs* is only carried up to the end of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty by its learned author. A supplementary note has therefore been added concerning the last of the Pharaohs, in which is given a succinct account of the downfall of Dynastic Egypt. A very clear table of the Nomes with their Egyptian and Greek capitals, and the names of their respective divinities, is likewise given, and is useful for reference. So also is the list of the principal kings of Ancient Egypt, with their cartouches. We do not know with whom rests the responsibility of the index, which is a weak point in the book. To a certain extent this is remedied by an unusually complete table of contents, illustrations, &c.

The fount of hieroglyphs used throughout the book is atrocious, being a mere caricature of the finely-drawn originals. It is difficult to recognize in the poor, effete-looking birds in the cartouche of Khufu the cleverly delineated quail that stands for the Egyptian 'u' sound, the difficulty of copying which is known to all students of the language who are not adepts with the pencil. No artist of the time of King Amen-hetep IV. would acknowledge to having drawn the cartouches of his sovereign which we find at the beginning of Chapter IX., nor would such work have passed the critical eye of that most artistic of the Pharaohs.

Having mentioned one or two faults we have found in the book, we must still say that, though in parts its style is naturally not entirely free from the accusation of dreariness made against the second edition, it will maintain its place as the history of Egypt most suited to the taste of the general public, since it is a readable book, and at the same time—with the one or two exceptions we have pointed out—one upon which the student need not be afraid to rely. That Mr. Le Page Renouf has lent his name to it, having 'read the whole work as it passed through the press,' is a sufficient guarantee of this.

Professor Petrie's *History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the XVIIth Dynasty* is in many respects very good; but we must also regretfully admit that it is very bad too. For Professor Petrie as an Egyptologist we have the profoundest admiration and respect. He has also all the gifts needed by a perfect excavator. An instinctive feeling, where absolute knowledge is not forthcoming, will guide him to a fertile

though hopeless-looking spot ; to untiring energy he joins indomitable courage and perseverance ; he has marvellous powers of classification, and he is the most methodical and accurate worker we have ever seen. No detail is too small to receive attention, and no fact too insignificant to be noted. He is at once a geologist, an engineer, a chemist, a land surveyor, and a photographer. He has also the happy faculty of being able to keep his large bands of workmen thoroughly busy and cheerful, and, what is more, he even manages to make his Arabs honest. To all these faculties he can add yet another—a vivid imagination, without which no man can be a successful explorer or excavator. Perhaps it is too much to expect that one who can wield the pickaxe as no one else can should also as successfully handle the pen. For it must be confessed that Professor Petrie *cannot* write. His grammar is bad ; his style worse. We very much wish that he had handed over all the information contained in this volume to some literary friend, and allowed him to put it into shape. The matter itself is invaluable ; it is splendidly tabulated and arranged ; but the words with which it is explained are for the confusing and not for the explanation of facts. The Professor's sentences are long and involved, and it is sometimes almost impossible to find the sense of them. Time after time is the subject of a sentence in the singular and the verb is in the plural ; and more often still the subject is in the plural—or there is more than one subject—and the verb is in the singular ; while his punctuation makes confusion worse confounded. Invariably also does he 'agree to' instead of *with* a person or thing ; and instead of differing *from* he differs *to* ; moreover, he always debates *of* instead of *concerning* or *upon* a subject. The style of writing is thoroughly slovenly and careless ; the verb at the beginning of his sentences frequently being in one tense, while at the end both tense and mood are completely changed. This volume is but the first of three which are expected from Professor Petrie's pen ; we sincerely trust that the other two books which will complete the history of Dynastic Egypt may be revised before going to press.

In his preface the author says that 'his aim in producing the present history has been to place in the hands of students a book of reference which shall suffice for all ordinary purposes.' As this book is clearly intended for students first, and the general reader afterwards, special care should have been taken to make the sense at all times perfectly lucid. Also that the same spelling and transliteration of names should have been adhered to throughout. The fifth king of the

Fourth Dynasty is called on p. 30, *Ra ded f*; on p. 63 the same monarch is spoken of as *Ra dad ef* and *Ra ded f*. Sometimes Professor Petrie transliterates the *Ra* sign in the cartouche at the end of the name, sometimes at the beginning; and this apparently quite arbitrarily, as neither reason nor explanation for it is given. By all means let him transliterate the king's name as *Ra dad f*; but then why should he not be consistent, and transliterate his predecessors as *Ra men kau*, and not *Men kau ra*? He does this in the index. What appear to be careless blunders of this kind are but too frequent throughout the whole book. In writing for students the golden rule is to give them credit for knowing nothing, and explain everything. If there is any good reason for this apparent caprice on the part of the author, it ought to have been explained. Then, again, in a great many places, Professor Petrie divides the compound names of the kings into their component words, which is an admirable plan, and most helpful to beginners; but this system is not carried out consistently by any means. If *Ra dad f* be the correct spelling, then surely *Ra kha f* and not *Khafra* should be written. In the index *Rakhaf* is mentioned, but on turning to p. 47 the student will find an account of *Khafra*; and a beginner would not know that *Rakhaf* and *Khafra* were one and the same person. This slovenly way of writing is liable to mislead and give gratuitous trouble. The author may of course have some good reason for his apparently erratic method of transliterating names; that being the case, he should have explained it. Professor Petrie writes about 'hieroglyphics,' an error which is surprising. For a dilettante or a very old-fashioned scholar to write thus is pardonable; not so is it for the only 'Professor of Egyptology' in England. For our own satisfaction we should like very much to know which is the correct method of spelling *Gizah*, as different ways are given. On p. 35 the royal titles are spoken of, and also 'the *ka* name.' It would have been a great help to the uninitiated if Dr. Petrie had explained what is meant by 'the *ka* name,' and also how the composite title of the king was built up.

The period over which *The History of Ancient Egypt* ranges is from the First to the Sixteenth Dynasties. Previous to the beginning of authentic history there was a traditional time filled up with Mythical and Divine Dynasties. To these historians have hitherto paid but scant attention; but Professor Petrie, after having carefully sifted all the evidence that he could gather together, has made out two Divine Dynasties,

containing respectively seven and nine Gods, one Mythical Dynasty, with thirty reigning Demigods, and one Mythical Dynasty of ten Kings. For the dynastic lists the authority 'is twofold : classical writings, more or less corrupted by will and by chance, and the papyri and monuments' (p. 16). Of the first three so-called historic dynasties the monuments know nothing ; and it is not until the Fourth Dynasty that we can absolutely prove from them the existence, not only of King Sneferu, but of the royal town of Ded Sneferu and the pyramid and temple of that monarch. It will be remembered that it is to Professor Petrie we owe the discovery of the Temple of Sneferu at Medum, the oldest in Egypt. It seems to have consisted of a courtyard and chambers.

'In this courtyard stood an altar for offerings, between two tall steles, without any inscription. On the temple walls were graffiti, dating from the old kingdom to the Eighteenth Dynasty ; five of these mention Sneferu as the king to whom this pyramid<sup>1</sup> was attributed. And the styles of the pyramid, the temple, and the tombs are in every respect more archaic than the works of any later period, so that there is no possible ground for throwing doubt on this repeated testimony. The temple is as plain as possible ; no stone is used but limestone, and there is not the slightest ornament or decoration in any part of it. The walls were built in the rough, and trimmed down afterwards. A peribolus wall enclosed the pyramid and temple ; the entrance to it was on the east side, leading to the temple, and the approach to it was by a causeway, walled on either hand, leading up from the plain' (p. 34).

We believe that after excavating and thoroughly examining the temple Professor Petrie was obliged to re-bury it for safety ; so little care would the Egyptian nation have then taken of this priceless historical treasure.

The Fourth Dynasty kings are chiefly known by their pyramids, their royal burying-places. No one knows as much about these giant tombs as Professor Petrie does ; for has he not surveyed and re-surveyed them, and penetrated into their inmost recesses, and studied their masonry, and considered their meaning?<sup>2</sup> In his *History* he has given just enough information about them to be very helpful, without going too far into technicalities. A list of all the priests and keepers of pyramids has, wherever possible, been given, which is the first time, we believe, that any one has attempted to tabulate these details. One great merit of Professor Petrie's book is that, in nearly every single instance, he gives one authority at least for a fact stated ; and he

<sup>1</sup> Of Medum.

<sup>2</sup> *The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh.*



invariably mentions the places where historical objects are to be actually seen, or where drawings of them can be found. The learned Professor has also more faith in Manetho than most of his Egyptological *confrères*, and not the least interesting portions of the volume under review are those where the ancient historian, the Lists of kings, and every known available monument are compared and carefully worked through. This has been done with the utmost method and precision. How much labour and research have been bestowed in 'verifying references' may be realized when we consider that Professor Petrie, not content with reports and museum catalogues, personally visited a great number of the public and private collections of Egyptian antiquities in Europe in order to satisfy himself as to the genuineness of the objects and their correct dates, and also to insure accuracy of translation.

If Professor Petrie's book be judged from the purely literary point of view, it is, as a History, disappointing. It is a catalogue of names and archaeological objects, tabulated chronologically, and as such it is very good. Therefore, as a text-book it is essential to the student, if not to the general reader. But it would be as impossible to sit down and read *The History of Ancient Egypt* as it would be to read a catalogue or a dictionary. The fact is that the history of Egypt has yet to be written; but the future writer of that history will find in Professor Petrie's first volume an admirable and exhaustive book for reference.

---

#### NOTE ON THE ELECTIONS FOR THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

FEW elections have been fought under greater difficulties than that recently held in London for members of the School Board. From the beginning to the end it seemed to be the object of the Opposition in the late Board to mystify the electors, and there is evidence that they to some extent succeeded. At the outset, instead of the two parties clearly laying down the real issue that was before the constituency, the cry was raised that the majority had put forth a most objectionable circular to the teachers. But what the circular contained was carefully left in the dark, and we know of several cases where eager opponents of the Moderates were converted into their active supporters by the simple process of reading over the circular to them. People may therefore naturally ask, Why was not this done in all cases? The answer is easy: many will never listen to an explanation, and others will never correct a judgment once formed, whilst still more would never go where there was a chance

of a misconception being set right. Then the Progressives, having felt the pulse of the electors by some tentative speeches and articles in newspapers about secular education being more logical and fair than the existing system, and finding that the advocacy of a system of non-religious education would be unpopular, turned round and proclaimed themselves to be the true supporters of real Bible teaching, and that their opponents were only anxious to secure sectarian instruction of an ultra-Roman kind, which they knew would be most disliked by the people, utterly regardless of the truth or otherwise of what they asserted. In the Chelsea division there was a picture of a large open Bible, and the electors were invited to support the Progressive candidates, who were in favour of its being placed before the children in Board schools.

To make matters worse, a few clergymen occupying dignified positions allowed themselves to be made the catspaws of some eager partisans of the Progressives, and joined themselves to many of the more distinguished Nonconformist ministers of an extreme Radical type. Such a union of Conservative Churchmen with Radical Nonconformists, in an association calling itself the Bible Education League, must have had a further influence in confusing the question in dispute to the ordinary uninstructed layman.

Then, not unnaturally, there was opposed to the Moderates the whole body of Gallios about religious matters. People calling themselves Churchmen, but never going to church, and political Dissenters looked upon the questions raised about religious instruction at the School Board as disputes about the infinitely little. In their view, whether our Lord was or was not the Son of God, whether the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was true or false, seemed a matter of no possible consequence, and therefore the only thing to do was to vote against those who regarded such questions as matters of importance. When we remember how large a proportion of the inhabitants of the metropolis never attend any place of worship it will be evident that the force of the party thus influenced must be very great. At previous elections most of them had probably never taken the trouble to vote, but when there was an opportunity of punishing men whom they regarded as disturbers of the peace they rushed to the poll as the citizens of Ephesus crowded into the theatre to scream against St. Paul for some hours, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians!'

These heterogeneous parties were greatly strengthened by a most unscrupulous use of the press. Several Conservative journals, to their shame be it spoken, joined with their Radical *confères* in decrying and misrepresenting the aims and actions of the Moderates. At few hotly contested elections has there been poured forth a darker volume of open and insinuated unfairness against Opposition candidates. Thus we heard of two well-dressed women who boasted of having voted against Mr. Athelstan Riley because his desire was to teach the Board school children to pray to the Pope; and of two men at the other end of London who voted against the Moderates because they pitied the poor children, who had already too much to learn

in Board schools, and they objected to candidates who were in favour of religion being added as another subject of instruction, though they thought it very desirable for all education to be religious. In some of the divisions the torrent of abuse rolled so fiercely as to disgust a few of the supporters of the party that used it; and we have seen letters from men who had intended to vote for the Progressives expressing disgust at the manner in which the Moderate candidates were spoken of, and enclosing contributions towards their election expenses, as well as promising to vote for them.

Then, to crown all, the 'No Popery' cry was raised: the prayers Mr. Athelstan Riley used in private and the religious observances he took part in were discussed in a manner that was not truthful in itself and was most discreditable to any party that could employ such ungentlemanly and untruthful tactics to secure a victory.

Confused as the great mass of the people, who really know nothing about the subject, must have been by such presentations of the candidates and of their aims, their power of determining how they ought to vote was rendered still more difficult by the active part which, it is said, was undertaken by many of the Board school teachers. No doubt many of the electors' children attended their schools; and if their teachers were kind to them they would wish their parents to vote in such a way as would please them; or, if they were afraid of them, they might desire to turn away their anger on future occasions by obliging them on this. Such parents would not understand the part some of the teachers had taken in opposition to the Board, neither would they be aware that, in the opinion of others, their material interests would be most advanced by the success of the Progressives.

Taking, then, into consideration the confused manner in which the subject in dispute was placed before the electors, the ignorance of a large proportion of them, the indifference of a still greater number, and the gross and most unscrupulous misrepresentations that, in every variety of form, were set forth, it is to us a matter for congratulation that the Moderates on the last Board secured a majority on this; whilst it can occasion no surprise that in so many instances the number of voters who polled for their opponents exceeded the number of their supporters. One effect, however, the recent election will certainly have, and that is that thoughtful people will have had their attention drawn to the religious teaching given in Board schools to an extent they never had before. We have never disguised our opinion that such teaching is bad at the best, because it never can satisfactorily deal with the gift of Divine grace to enable men to fulfil the Divine law as taught by the Bible and the Church. For this is a subject that is closely bound up with all the disputes between the Church and the sects, and therefore has to be ignored under any system of undenominational instruction. The literature issued during the recent election has clearly shown that not only must this branch of religious teaching be set aside, but that instruction concerning other fundamental truths of Christianity is in danger of being left an open question, and that an influential

party desires to leave it to the chance accident of the bias of the mind of each head teacher whether such truths as the Incarnation of our Divine Lord and the Holy Trinity are affirmed or denied. It is greatly to be regretted that the parents of the children who attend Board schools cannot comprehend the importance of such teaching. If they did they would certainly claim their right, as citizens of a country that professes to believe in religious liberty, to demand that their children should be educated to believe the faith which they themselves hold. The Clergy could not undertake a more useful duty than that of teaching parents the influence which the faith they profess must have upon character and life if it is really believed and held, and that it is in childhood that, for the most part, the foundations must be laid of definite and heartfelt belief.

The state of things revealed so clearly by what has just happened makes it more incumbent than ever for the Church to have a definite policy with respect to her schools. For some time past many anxious managers of denominational schools have been urging that the struggle to maintain their schools is greater than they can bear much longer. The improvement in the schools, their apparatus and their staff, insisted upon by the present Vice-President of the Privy Council, have required an amount of self-sacrificing liberality on the part of those who really value religious education that it has been gratifying to find forthcoming. Made, as these requirements have been, at a time when trade and agriculture are suffering from severe depression, it would not have been surprising if they had led to the abandonment of many Church schools and the creation of many School Boards. During the past year only fifty-eight new School Boards were established, and of these forty-three were called into existence compulsorily, and in all probability in opposition to the wishes of the inhabitants, who were called upon hastily to provide an increased amount of school accommodation, for which the requisite funds could not be raised in a hurry, and it by no means follows that in any instance a Church school was surrendered. But, whilst prodigious efforts have been made to support our schools, and nearly a million of money has been raised during the year for their improvement, there has been a growing feeling that justice requires a more equitable division of the funds for educational purposes between the voluntary and Board schools. Demands for a share of the School Board rates for the maintenance of voluntary schools have been made in a variety of quarters and with ever-increasing force, and as a matter of equity it seems to us that the claim cannot be resisted; for the supporters of voluntary schools, equally with the friends of Board schools, contribute those rates; and the fact that the children are instructed in the religion of their parents, and not in a State-invented system of undenominational religion, ought to be no bar to their receiving a full share of public support. It was on these grounds that in October 1893 we strongly urged the right to claim help from the rates; we then felt, as we still feel, the importance of securing additional support for our voluntary schools, to enable them to keep

pace with the ever-increasing demands of the Education Department, and that this additional support ought to be derived from public sources. Whilst this feeling is largely entertained by the friends of religious education there is a division of opinion about the source from which it is to be derived ; and as our object is the good of the schools, and not the success of any particular scheme, we can cordially support whatever plan will be most likely to command success. Experience has shown that the difficulty of maintaining the independence and religious integrity of the denominational schools, if they are once made recipients of rate aid, has rendered the proposal most objectionable in many influential quarters. It is needless to say that to obtain such aid Church opinion must be expressed with great unanimity. At a large representative meeting held in the rooms of the National Society, at the invitation of its Committee, on November 22, 1893, it was found that there was a great divergence of opinion on the subject, whilst it was generally felt that the voluntary schools must obtain a larger amount of public support than they at present receive if they are to remain as efficient as Board schools. To meet the opposing opinions expressed, it was suggested that the two Archbishops should nominate a Committee of representative men from their respective provinces to consider the question, and to recommend a policy to Church people. This has been done : the Committee has held many meetings, and has carefully discussed the various proposals that have been put forth, and has happily arrived at a unanimous conclusion, which it is to be hoped that the friends of voluntary schools will cordially accept, and do whatever they can in order that the proposals may receive that legislative sanction without which they are necessarily inoperative. Their main proposal is thus expressed in the Report <sup>1</sup> which they have issued :

‘ Many of the objections which prevented unanimity as to getting aid for voluntary schools from the rates would not apply to proposals for getting such aid from the Imperial Government. It has been suggested that if the Imperial Government, as is done to a great extent in Ireland, were to take on itself the duty of maintaining the entire staff of teachers, allowing neither School Boards nor managers of voluntary schools to diminish or to add to the grant so made, the working of all the grants might be much simplified, and the voluntary schools might be relieved not only from some part of the burden which is now too much for them, but from the unfair competition in obtaining teachers to which they are now exposed. At present the School Boards, with practically unlimited resources at command, have undue advantage in staffing their schools. This is no gain whatever to education generally, since it only transfers teachers from one set of schools to another. Grants from the Imperial Revenue are always more fair to all sorts of schools than aid from the rates. Such grants involve no risk of any objectionable interference with the appointment of teachers, or with the management of the schools, since the interference is always strictly limited to the purpose of securing efficiency. Nor do such grants raise any religious question whatever, since the Government are compelled by Act of Parliament to regard such questions as outside their province.’

<sup>1</sup> See *Times*, January 7, 1895.

Accordingly it is added—

‘The Committee is decidedly of opinion that if aid is to be sought from any public source for voluntary schools it is better to apply to the Imperial than to the local exchequer. The Committee submits that the form of grant most fair, and most likely to secure good educational results, would be one which should aim at providing an adequate teaching staff for all public elementary schools, Board and voluntary, whilst preventing much of the present competition between them. And the first recommendation of the Committee is that the efforts of Churchmen should be directed towards securing this result.’

If it be asked whether such a measure of assistance would not greatly add to the sums required from public sources, the obvious answer is, that it would be far less than what would have to be raised by rates or by taxes if the voluntary schools were compelled to close their doors. As a matter of fact such a grant as that suggested would be considerably less than a million beyond what is now paid out of the taxes in the form of a Government grant, and by the ratepayers out of the rates for the salaries of the teachers in Board schools. It would, moreover, put an end to the heart-burning which is daily finding stronger expression from the teachers in voluntary schools, who think themselves unfairly dealt with by the State, and is also felt by the managers of voluntary schools, who resent the injustice done to their teachers by the State regulation of public money.

The recent contest at the election of the London School Board has shown that whilst the great mass of the voters desire religious education in Board schools they have very vague ideas of what religious education is ; and it has also made clear to those who have closely watched the contest that in the camp of the Progressives there is a strong desire for purely secular teaching in all Board schools, and that this desire was not more openly expressed only because it was feared that if it was insisted upon their candidates would be defeated. The great majority of elections for provincial School Boards have shown an increased uneasiness under the pressure of rates, and a consequent determination to eject from office all who favour a heavier expenditure. Under these circumstances we may expect a growing dislike to the present system. The friends of voluntary schools feel themselves unjustly treated, and that, as matters now stand, liberty of conscience in educational matters cannot be fairly said to exist in England : the thorough-going admirers of the Board school system must, at no distant time, stand forth in their true colours as the supporters of purely secular education, whilst the great mass of ratepayers will insist upon some alleviation of the burdens under which they are groaning.

That the proposals of the Archbishops' Committee will satisfy all objectors, is more than can be anticipated ; but of the three classes we have named the first and the third ought heartily to approve it ; those who favour secular teaching and desire to expel all definite religious instruction from the elementary schools of the country will naturally dislike what is proposed, as it would form a barrier against the end at which they are aiming. We trust, therefore, that men



of the various schools of religious thought, who desire definite religious instruction to be given in the truths which they themselves hold, will unite in support of the scheme now proposed. If they do we believe that they will succeed in obtaining legislative sanction for what is suggested by the Archbishops' Committee as an educational policy for the Church, and so secure a really efficient system of instruction in all schools without so large a share of the irritation that now exists. Hitherto we have not infrequently failed to carry measures that are desirable because of divisions in our ranks. Under the stress of existing difficulties it remains to be seen whether earnest men are more bent upon advocating proposals which they imagine to be the best, or whether, in consideration of the greatness of the interest at stake, they will be content to work loyally together to accomplish the object which they desire, in a way that has already secured support from men of somewhat different views, and which is, of course, open to such modifications as may be found desirable after it has been maturely considered.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

*A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church.* Second Series. Translated into English, with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes. Volumes I.-VII. under the Editorial Supervision of HENRY WACE, D.D., Principal of King's College, London, and PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, in connexion with a number of Patristic Scholars of Europe and America. Vol. XI. *Sulpitius Severus; Vincent of Lérins; John Cassian.* (Oxford: James Parker and Company; New York: Christian Literature Company, MDCCCXCIV.)

OUR readers have already had before them our estimate of the earlier volumes of this series,<sup>1</sup> and may be aware that while we have found ourselves able to speak in terms of high praise of the conception and general plan of the work, we have been constrained to note several instances in which the execution of the plan seemed to us to fall short of the ideal which had been set before us, and not a few in which there seemed to be a lack of editorial supervision. The regretted death of the American general editor was, perhaps, sufficient to account in part for this omission in the last volume, but we have already had occasion to express the opinion that the subscribers had a right to expect a more explicit statement of the relation of the editors to the work which is guaranteed by their names, and the volume which is now before us produces the same feeling in a somewhat stronger degree. The title-page tells the reader that it is 'volume xi.', though, as far as we have any means of knowing, vols. viii.-x., which were duly announced in

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1892, vols. i. and ii.; July 1893, vols. iii. and iv.; July, 1894, vols. v.-vii. 'Short Notice.'

the 'prospectus,' have not yet appeared. This, however, may be due to accidents over which the editors could have had no control, and there would have been no ground of complaint if a note had been inserted explaining the change of order, and assuring the subscribers that the important works of *Ephraem Syrus*, *Hilary of Poitiers*, and *Ambrose*, promised under the names of Professor Gwynn, Professor Sanday, and Mr. de Romestin, would soon be forthcoming. But the title-page, which is in general appearance so much like its predecessors that few readers would perhaps observe the difference, bears the names of Dr. Wace and Dr. Schaff in large type, and in much smaller type tells us that it is 'volumes i.-vii.' which had the advantage of their 'editorial supervision.' Now we can but think that it was due alike to the distinguished editors and contributors, to the eminent publishers, and to the subscribers that the fact of Dr. Schaff's death should have been noticed, with at least some recognition of the great work which he had done, and a statement as to what portions of the present volume, if any, had the advantage of passing through the hands of any general editor, and if of any one, then of whom. Had any part of the present volume been edited by Dr. Schaff before his fatal illness? Has any part been edited by Dr. Wace? If so what part or parts? If not, what is the meaning of the names on the title-page? Are the future volumes to be edited by Dr. Wace? Is anyone to take the place of Dr. Schaff, and if so who? These are questions which naturally occur, and the answers to them should, we think, have found a prominent place in the present volume. We have looked for them in vain.

Nor is the natural demand for explanation satisfied by a general survey of the volume. The copy of the prospectus which is in our hands led us to expect the following works: (i.) CASSIAN, *Collations [sic] of the Fathers*; (ii.) RULE OF ST. BENEDICT; (iii.) SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Life of St. Martin of Tours, Dialogues, Letters*; (iv.) VINCENT OF LÉRINS, *Commonitory on the Rule of Faith*. Of these the RULE OF ST. BENEDICT has been altogether omitted, and more than two-thirds of the whole volume are occupied with the works of Cassian, of which we have not only the promised *Conferences*, but also *The Institutes of the Canobia* and *The Seven Books on the Incarnation of the Lord*. The order is changed, and is now chronologically right; but it has the inconvenience of placing the small but invaluable tractate of Vincent *On the Rule of Faith* in the midst of the monastic works of Severus and Cassian. When we come to examine the sub-titles we find that THE WORKS OF SULPITIUS SEVERUS are 'translated, with Preface and Notes, by Rev. [sic] Alexander Roberts, D.D., Professor of Humanity, University of St. Andrew's, Scotland,' though all that we find by way of preface is included in two pages under the title 'Life and Writings of Sulpitius Severus'; that THE COMMONITORY OF VINCENT LÉRINS is 'translated by the Rev. C. A. Heurtley, D.D., the Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and Canon of Christ Church,' who exceeds the promise of the title by adding a short 'introduction' and some valuable notes; that THE WORKS OF JOHN CASSIAN are

'translated, with Prolegomena, Prefaces, and Notes, by Rev. [sic] Edgar C. S. Gibson, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Wells, Somerset,' who does, indeed, give us some useful prolegomena, but adds nothing by way of 'prefaces;' and we are sure that it is without his knowledge that the original 'prefaces' of Cassian are assigned to himself, as in the sub-title they seem to be.

As far as we have been able to test the translations in this volume they are adequate, as was, indeed, to be expected from the scholars who are responsible for them, though we think that Dr. Roberts somewhat frequently escapes from a difficulty by simply telling his readers that it is obscure. We have, however, to remember that the greater part of the volume—all except the *Commonitory*—appears in English for the first time, and that the difficulties of such translation are neither slight nor few. Whether it was worth while to undertake so much labour for the purpose of giving the English reader the opportunity, which we should think that he will seldom use, of studying the untrustworthy *History* of Sulpitius or the detailed monastic *Institutes* of Cassian is doubtful, and the utility of the general arrangement is, in our opinion, more than doubtful when we remember what important works have been omitted in earlier volumes of this series. Most students to whom the works of Sulpitius and Cassian are in their fulness important would be able to read them in the original Latin, and would find in the editions of the text, or in such easily accessible books as the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* or Ceillier's *Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclésiastiques*, information and assistance which we are bound to say he would often search for in vain in the present volume; and the ordinary English reader would have been well contented, as the Greeks were,<sup>1</sup> with a translation of one of the epitomes of the *Institutes* and the *Conferences* of Cassian, which were made at an early date on account of the extent as well as of the semi-Pelagianism of the originals, while the reader of Sulpitius might well have been spared many of the details of the *Life of St. Martin*, much of *The Sacred History*, and all the *Doubtful Letters*. Space might then have been found for the promised *Rule of St. Benedict*, for full historical and explanatory notes, for prolegomena on the scale of some which have already enriched this series, and especially for a full treatment, with these authorities as a text, of the whole subject of Eastern and Western monasticism.

As we proceed to estimate the different parts of this volume we cannot think that the choice of Dr. Roberts, as the sub-editor of the *Life and Writings of Sulpitius*, was a very happy one, or that he has realized the standard which some of his predecessors had led us to expect. He has apparently never arrived, though this would seem to be a necessary preliminary step, at a satisfactory conclusion on the alleged miracles of St. Martin, and, instead of helping the student by dealing with the subject as a whole, he gives a number of notes and quotations which are not always consistent, and which culminate in the following remarks that appear at the same opening of the page:

<sup>1</sup> Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* 197. See p. 194.

'In spite of the combined testimony of Martin and Sulpitius, here referred to, few will have any doubt as to the real character of this narrative' (p. 16).

'It seems extremely difficult (to recur to the point once more), after reading this account of St. Martin by Sulpitius, to form any certain conclusion regarding it. . . . Altogether, this *Life of St. Martin* seems to bring before us one of the puzzles of history. The saint himself must evidently have been a very extraordinary man, to impress one of the talents and learning of Sulpitius so remarkably as he did; but it is extremely hard to say how far the miraculous narratives, which enter so largely into the account before us, were due to pure invention, or unconscious hallucination' (p. 17).

We suspect that Dr. Roberts's real view is expressed by Milner, whom he quotes—'I should be ashamed, as well as think the labor ill spent, to recite the stories at length which Sulpitius gives us'—and that he finds it difficult to reconcile this feeling with the position of translator of these works. Nor will the student of *The Sacred History* find much more guidance. The editor thinks it enough to tell him—

'The *Sacred History* of Sulpitius has for its object to present a compendious history of the world from the Creation down to the year A.D. 400. The first and longer portion of the work is simply an abridgment of the Scripture narrative. The latter part is more interesting and valuable, as it deals with events lying outside of Scripture, and respecting which we are glad to obtain information from all available sources. Unfortunately, however, Sulpitius is not always a trustworthy authority. His inaccuracies in the first part of his work are very numerous, and will be found pointed out in our version' (p. 2).

It does not seem to occur to the editor to point out—though the fact was before him in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, for example—that the really important part of the *History* is that which deals with the contemporary Priscillianist heresy (capp. 46–51), nor is there any evidence that he is acquainted with Bernay's important monograph, *Die Chronik des Sulp. Sev.* Of the critical care which the editor thinks worthy of his subject the following extract from the few remarks which must, we suppose, be called an introduction is an example:

'Most of the *Letters* here given are deemed spurious by Halm, the latest editor of our author. He has, nevertheless, included the whole of them in his edition, and we have thought it desirable to follow his example in our translation' (p. 2).

It is satisfactory to be able to speak more favourably of the *Prolegomena* to the Works of Cassian, which give a good *Life of Cassian* (pp. 183–193) and a sufficient, though not quite independent or critical, sketch of *The History of Cassian's Writings, MSS., and Editions* (pp. 193–197). The editor had here the great advantage of following Petschenig, who edited Cassian for the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, and he has used it fully. If, however, it was necessary to present the whole of the works of Cassian to the English reader much more space and care should, in our opinion, have been given to the frame in which it is set.

And it is specially pleasant to welcome from the hands of the

venerable Lady Margaret Professor, to whom successive generations of Oxford students have long been indebted, and whose own First Class carries us back to the year 1827, a careful translation of *The Commonitory of Vincent of Lérins*, accompanied by a brief but thoughtful *Introduction* and some useful notes. We could desire, indeed, greater completeness, and few contributions to modern English theology could, in our opinion, be more valuable than a good critical edition of the *Commonitorium* with full prolegomena and notes. It would naturally include essays on Tradition ; on the relation of the final chapters (with their introduction of the Apostolic See and Sextus and Celestine) to the remainder of the work ; on the connexion between the *Commonitorium* and the *Quicumque vult* ; on the semi-Pelagianism of the school of Lérins. Dr. Cazenove's too brief but very able article on Vincent, in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, suggests how valuable such a work might be. Meanwhile, as the use of Vincent, even among our younger theologians, seems frequently to be confined to quoting (and not always with knowledge of their context) the words *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*, and in the hope of leading them to the study of a treatise which has special instruction for this generation, we present to our readers two short specimens of our author's matter and his translator's style :

'This being the case, he is the true and genuine Catholic who loves the truth of God, who loves the Church, who loves the Body of Christ, who esteems divine religion and the Catholic Faith above everything, above the authority, above the regard, above the genius, above the eloquence, above the philosophy, of every man whatsoever ; who sets light by all of these, and continuing steadfast and established in the faith, resolves that he will believe that, and that only, which he is sure the Catholic Church has held universally and from ancient time ; but that whatsoever new and unheard-of doctrine he shall find to have been fictitiously introduced by some one or another, besides that of all, or contrary to that of all the saints, this, he will understand, does not pertain to religion, but is permitted as a trial, being instructed especially by the words of the blessed Apostle Paul, who writes thus in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, "There must needs be heresies, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you" . . .<sup>3</sup> (cap. xx.)

'But some one will say perhaps, Shall there, then, be no progress in Christ's Church? Certainly ; all possible progress. For what being is there, so envious of men, so full of hatred to God, who would seek to forbid it? Yet on condition that it be real progress, not alteration of the faith. For progress requires that the subject be enlarged in itself, alteration, that it be transformed into something else. The intelligence, then, the knowledge, the wisdom, as well of individuals as of all, as well of one man as of the whole Church, ought, in the course of ages and centuries, to increase and make much and vigorous progress ; but yet only in its own kind : that is to say, in the same doctrine, in the same sense, and in the same meaning.

'The growth of religion in the soul must be analogous to the growth of the body, which, though in process of years it is developed and attains its full size, yet remains still the same. There is a wide difference between the flower of youth and the maturity of age ; yet they who were once young are still the same now that they have become old, insomuch

that though the stature and outward form of the individual are changed, yet his nature is one and the same, his person is one and the same. . . .

'In like manner, it behoves Christian doctrine to follow the same laws of progress, so as to be consolidated by years, enlarged by time, refined by age, and yet withal to continue uncorrupt and unadulterate, complete and perfect in all the measurement of its parts, and, so to speak, in all its proper members and senses, admitting no change, no waste of its distinctive property, no variation in its limits' (cap. xxiii.).

1. *The Four Gospels in Syriac*. Transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by the late ROBERT L. BENSLEY, M.A., and by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., and by F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A. With an Introduction by AGNES SMITH LEWIS. (Cambridge University Press, 1894.)
2. *A Translation of the Four Gospels from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest*. By AGNES SMITH LEWIS, M.R.A.S. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

It is now nearly three years since the manuscript, which is now published, was discovered by Mrs. Lewis on her first visit to the monastery on Mount Sinai in February 1892. On this occasion the whole manuscript, or, at any rate, the part of it on which the Syriac Gospels had been written, was photographed. It appears, from Mrs. Lewis's preface to her translation, that it was through the agency of Mr. Burkitt and the late Professor Bensley that the discovery was made that the newly-found manuscript contained a text of the same type as the Curetonian. As a result of this discovery a second visit to the monastery was undertaken in the beginning of 1893, the three scholars whose names appear on the title-page being this time of the party. They were courteously received by the monks, and the manuscript was very carefully studied. This was not an easy task, as not only is the text of the Syriac Gospels underneath a later hand (this later hand being of the eighth century), but the sheets used by the original scribe of the Gospels have been transposed by the monk who used them for his *Martyrology*. And, more than this, the writing has in places so faded that it was found necessary to resort to a chemical reagent in order to make the characters legible.

The publication of the manuscript, the text of which has been carefully investigated by the Syriac scholars above mentioned, one of whom, alas ! was cut off soon after his return to England, has been anxiously awaited by students of textual criticism. The first breath of rumour as to its contents seemed to unduly exaggerate the importance of the discovery, and was followed by a report that it was, after all, not of any great value ; and now we have before us the printed text (which, we may feel confident, is a careful reproduction of the manuscript) to speak for itself. We do not propose in the present notice to go at any length into the various interesting points raised by the discovery. This we shall reserve for our next number. We may content ourselves here with just pointing out some of the grounds on which it deserves attention and examination. In the first place, it is in itself a very old manuscript. Mr. Burkitt



has very carefully discussed many things in connexion with it in a very clear and scholarly contribution to the *Guardian* of October 31, and he there expresses his belief, based on technical grounds, that 'the date cannot be later than the beginning of the fifth century, and may very likely be half a century earlier.' This would make the manuscript one of the very oldest manuscripts containing the text of the Gospels which has come down to us. The date of the manuscript is therefore in itself sufficient to arrest and command attention. But, again, the type of text, the variations from the ordinary readings which it contains, are also, on investigation, found to be remarkable. They have very many points in common with what Dr. Hort regarded as the oldest form of the Syriac version, for which we have had hitherto to depend on one manuscript alone—viz. that discovered and published by the late Canon Cureton, which is now in the British Museum. Hardly anything would have been more unanimously accorded a place among the *desiderata* of textual critics than some manuscript allied to this special type of Syriac text. Such a 'find' would have enabled critics to say whether those readings in the Curetonian—which seemed to friends and enemies alike to depreciate its value—were due to the scribe of the manuscript or to the type of the text which it presented. And there can be no doubt that our newly-found authority is sufficiently dissimilar from the Curetonian to enable us to say that some of the readings which seemed to throw discredit on the value of the latter are, after all, due to the scribe of the manuscript, or, at any rate, formed no part of the version as it originally stood. Another most important point on which we now have further light is the position of the *Diatessaron* of Tatian among the Syriac versions. This, as is well known, was a Harmony of the Four Gospels, composed by Tatian, and in use not later than 175 A.D. The complete recovery of this, through the medium of an Arabic translation, was noticed by us some few years ago. The point of greatest interest is whether the *Diatessaron* was or was not the earliest form of Syriac Gospels. It was contended that the Curetonian manuscript contained readings which would go to show that the *Diatessaron* was the oldest form in which the Gospels were made known to Syriac-speaking Christians, and that the Syriac version of the *separate* Gospels was subsequent to, and based on, this work of Tatian. Mr. Burkitt, whose arguments deserve careful consideration, thinks that the recently discovered manuscript points to the fact of the version of the separate Gospels being prior to the Harmony. If so, we should have conclusive evidence of the existence of a Syriac version of the Gospels at any rate not later than the middle of the second century.

There is one passage in which the reading is so startling that we must also make reference to it. It is the passage in St. Matthew in which the circumstances attending the birth of our Lord are described, especially St. Matt. i. 21-25:

'For she shall bear *thee* a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. . . . Now when Joseph arose

VOL. XXXIX.—NO. LXXVIII.

L L

from his sleep he did as his wife commanded him, and he married his wife, and *she bare him a son*, and he called his name Jesus.'

We have italicized the important variants. Here the new manuscript makes one of its most remarkable deviations from the Curetonian and from Tatian's *Diatessaron*. Fresh facts, says Mr. Rendel Harris in an article in the *Contemporary* dealing with this newly-discovered manuscript, fast become public property, and even fresh hypotheses, which ought to move more slowly, trickle nearly as rapidly as fresh facts. And, we may add, the hypotheses come to be considered as facts. It is not surprising that opponents of Christianity should have jumped at this reading as though it established the human parentage of our Lord, and that it should have been found a handy weapon for 'Progressists' (save the mark!) in the recent London School Board election. It is not, perhaps, surprising that, on the other side, as in a recent number of the *Church Times*, the critical value of the manuscript should have been thus appreciated on account of its reading in this passage: 'It is one of that group of errant manuscripts which are classed under the name of the Western Text. Thus, in itself and in its alliances it is corrupt and bad.' The really sound position would seem to be to say that one of the cardinal points—we may say *the* cardinal point—of our Christian faith cannot depend on a point of textual criticism, and that in regard to one verse or passage, and yet to admit the interest and value of many of the readings found in the manuscript on account of their obvious antiquity. This obvious antiquity does not necessarily mean that they are really the right readings, for the oft-quoted instance of the valuelessness of the earliest manuscript of Euripides is a case in point, and in regard to the New Testament it is a commonplace of criticism that most of the wrong readings can find some support for the view that they existed at least as early as the second century. Indeed, it was only before the letter of the text came to have a supreme value set on it that such wide variations would be possible. That the readings in question cannot disprove the Virgin birth of Christ is undoubted. How they are to be explained, and what effect they will have on the estimation in which this new addition to our evidence will be held, are points which cannot be settled without the careful and unprejudiced examination of the arguments of textual critics. As yet it is impossible to do this, and we shall not endeavour now to do so. We have, however, thought it right, on this the earliest opportunity, to draw the attention of our readers to the undoubted value of the new 'find,' and to thank the scholars who have put the text before us in such a satisfactory way, and last, but not least, Mrs. Lewis, to whom the credit of the discovery is due, for her patient prosecution of the inquiry, and also (though there are marks of haste which show that it is not *absolutely* trustworthy and scholarly) for making the text accessible in an English dress to those whose ignorance of Syriac will debar them from dealing with the original.

*Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri, nuovamente rivedute nel testo.*  
Da Dr. E. MOORE. (Oxford : Nella Stamperia dell' Università,  
1894.)

IN the production of this beautiful work, the scrupulous and conscientious editorship of Dr. Moore has been worthily supported by the taste and judgment of the University printer and the binder. For many a day we have seen nothing more exquisite in appearance than the dainty bijou edition in three volumes which a purchaser has the option of procuring. The single volume edition does not please us so much : its double columns weary the eye, and constantly remind the reader of the necessity for compression which existed. But no such feeling disturbs the peruser of any one of the three miniature volumes ; albeit the compression of matter in them is simply marvellous. Glancing from them at the four bulky quartos of Zatta, one begins almost to doubt the assertion that they do in fact comprise, in as it were a nutshell, all Dante's works. Yet so it is. Indeed, the utmost catholicity of inclusion has been practised. Everything that has been attributed to the great author, with the exception of the undoubtedly spurious Italian *Epistle to Giovanni da Polenta*, is here presented to us. All the *Epistles*, with the above exception ; the whole *Canzoniere* ; the *Credo* and the *Seven Penitential Psalms* ; even the *Questio de Aqua et Terra*, of which no manuscript exists, and which was for the first time published by Padre Moncetti in 1508, as Dante's alleged work it is true, but avowedly as corrected *passim* and brought up to date by the reverend editor—all these, we say, however doubtful the authorship of many of them, are set forth *in extenso*. We think that Dr. Moore has exercised a wise discretion in omitting none, and in declining to mix in the strife which has for some years been waged in Italy and Germany upon the question of the authenticity of the various *Opere Minori*.

A brief synopsis of the sources from which he tells us that his text has been collected will be of interest to our readers. And first and foremost, as was a foregone conclusion, he has based that of the *Divina Commedia* upon Dr. Witte's renowned edition of 1862. Not, however, that he has followed it servilely. On the contrary—and the reflection is an ample justification for the compilation of a fresh text—he reminds us of Witte's own admission that he had in some instances adopted a reading from one or other of his four collated codici, of which he was far from satisfied that it was the right one. He further points out that in the thirty odd years which have elapsed since Witte's publication, an immense number of additional variants have been discovered by Dantophilists ; and says that he has made frequent use of such of these as he has himself discussed in his well-known work on *The Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia*, of which, we may observe in passing, we gave a Short Notice at the time of its publication. Witte's text has also been followed in the *Vita Nuova* and the *De Monarchia* ; that of Fraticelli in the *Epistles*, the *Questio*, and the *Minor Poems* ; his, also, in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, but with corrections supplied from the recently published codice of Grenoble, and with a revised punctuation ; his, again, in

L L 2

the *Canzoniere*, but retouched, and with variations by Mr. York Powell in the order of the compositions.

Dante's remaining work, the *Convito*, has evidently given Dr. Moore a greater amount of trouble than any of the others. The text has been entirely revised and reconstructed out of the 'pretto garbuglio'<sup>1</sup> of the perversions of amanuenses and the unbridled licence of the conjectures of editors, such as e.g. Giuliani and the Milanese. Even Witte himself does not escape censure for his emendations. In setting himself to evolve order out of this chaos, Dr. Moore has, in the first place, had recourse to a scrupulous collation of the only two codici of the *Convito* which exist in England. One of these, which belongs to himself, bears a date which is either 1463 or 1493—probably the latter—and was originally the property of one Pier Antonio Buonaparte. Dr. Moore thinks it is of a different family to the other codice, which is in the Canonici collection in the Bodleian. It is frequently in accord with the excellent codice Riccardiano so praised by Fraticelli, also with the Kirkup codice cited by Witte, and by Nannucci in marginal notes written by him to the first two books in a copy of the *Convito* in the Taylorian Library at Oxford. The frequent but unimportant variations in it of the order of the words in the ordinary text are attributed by Dr. Moore to the caprice of the amanuensis. It appears, in fact, to be a careless copy from a good original type. The codice in the Bodleian, which is undated, but probably earlier in time than Dr. Moore's, keeps closer to the ordinary text. Dr. Moore has also availed himself of the readings of other codici of the greatest authority, furnished by the critical notes of former editors, as Giuliani and Fraticelli; and, lastly, of the new and old *Centurie Correctionum* of Witte, and the *Saggio* of the Milanese editors. Knowing as we do his judicious critical faculty, we can readily accept his assurance that he has carefully avoided arbitrary conjectures and capricious alterations; yet that with few exceptions he has generally found it possible to arrive at a satisfactory meaning with very trifling aid from conjectures warranted by a line by line comparison of the texts of two or three codici, choosing one here and another there; and by a slight change in the order of the words. Not, however, that he has been able to clear up some passages of enormous difficulty in construction and of roughness in expression; defects which are in no way inconsistent with their authenticity, inasmuch as Dante more than once in the *Convito* excuses himself at great length for having written it in the vulgar tongue instead of in the Latin, whose greater power to express mental conceptions he frankly acknowledges. A distinguishing mark is appended to the few passages where Dr. Moore has been driven to use conjecture pure and simple.

It will be seen from the foregoing observations that the reputation of *The Oxford Dante* must in great measure depend upon the estimate formed by Dantophilists of the restored text of the *Convito*. We have not had time to study this, and can therefore do no more

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Moore's felicitous expression in his Italian Preface. It may be fairly expressed in English by 'a pretty muddle.'

York

en Dr.  
ne text  
to gar-  
cidence  
anese.  
ns. In  
has, in  
ly two  
which  
—pro-  
ntonio  
e other

It is  
praised  
nd by  
ooks in  
he fre-  
ords in  
of the  
a good  
ed, but  
e ordi-  
ings of  
l notes  
he new  
of the  
faculty,  
avoided  
ith few  
satisfac-  
y a line  
ing one  
of the  
me pas-  
s in ex-  
h their  
*Convito*  
e vulgar  
mental  
k is ap-  
n to use

reputa-  
pon the  
*Convito*.  
no more  
t may be

than express our conviction that when put to the proof it will not be found wanting. The time which we have had at our disposal has been employed in looking at many crucial passages in the text of the *Divina Commedia*. Here, as was to be expected, we do not always find ourselves in agreement with Dr. Moore's choice of this or that reading, or with his punctuation in some instances of disputed *punteggiatura*. But the old saw, 'quot homines tot sententiæ,' is nowhere more applicable than to the different views of Dantophilists upon such subjects. Generally speaking, however, the text thoroughly commends itself to us. We feel bound, on the other hand, to mention one exception. *Pace* Dr. Moore, and Scartazzini whom he has followed, we are not to be persuaded that Dante perpetrated the line, *Purg.* xxx. 73, as here printed :

'Guardaci ben, ben sem, ben sem Beatrice !'

If we had no other reasons for this opinion than Scartazzini's own admission that the repetition of 'ben sem' is cacophonous, and Dionisi's criticism that the recurrence of the letter 'e' seven times in eight syllables is enough to condemn the reading, we should still hold it. Scartazzini calls in aid Di Costanzo's comment that Dante's description of Beatrice in line 70 as speaking 'regalmente' leads the reader to expect her to speak of herself in the plural number, after the manner of sovereigns. But as well might it be contended that St. Francis of Assisi, of whom we read in *Par.* xi. 91, 92, that he

'regalmente sua dura intenzione  
Ad Innocenzio aperse,'

introduced himself to the Pope after the same fashion :

'Guardaci ben ; ben sem, ben sem Francesco !'

Such a royal style as this is as much out of keeping with the character of Beatrice as it would be with that of 'Il poverel di Dio.' And, so far as regards Beatrice, let us also remember Dante's pathetic comparison, a few lines further on (*Purg.* xxx. 79, 80), of her manner to him to that of a stern mother to a son. Mothers do not style themselves 'we' in chiding their children.

The common reading of line 73, viz. :

'Guardami ben, ben son, ben son Beatrice !'

is, on the other hand, the simple and natural expression of her who, when she descended into Limbo on her mission to Virgil, had told him—

'Io son Beatrice, che ti faccio andare.'

*Inf.* ii. 70.

Had she been puffed up with so-called queenly importance, we surely should have looked for its display towards a poor spirit in Limbo, rather than towards him who was to be her honoured companion through the heavens. So far, however, from thus treating Dante *de haut en bas*, we find her, even after they had risen together into the Heaven of the Fixed Stars, by which time her loveliness had

become infinitely more transcendent,<sup>1</sup> encouraging him to look upon her afresh, in words almost identical with those now under discussion:

'Apri gli occhi, e riguarda qual son io.'

Par. xxiii. 46.

Not '*quali sem noi*,' though she was then close to

'Il trono che i suoi meriti le sortiro.'

Par. xxxi. 69.

We could say much more, but what has been said may suffice to justify us in remaining anti-'*Sem*'-ites in this matter. The line,

'Guardaci ben, ben sem, ben sem Beatrice,'

is unworthy alike of utterance by her '*angelica voce*,' and of finding a place in '*sua favella*.'

In conclusion, this notice would be very incomplete if it omitted a well-deserved tribute of admiration to the copious and lucid index of Mr. Paget Toynbee, *Dei Nomi Propri e delle Cose Notabili contenute nelle Opere di Dante*, which is appended to the work. No pains have been spared in making this a thorough guide to the student, through all Dante's allusions to persons, events, and matters of importance, wheresoever they occur, whether in prose or in poetry, in the Italian or in the Latin compositions. It is in many respects a concordance of the subject-matter as well as an index. Witness the compendious references given under such titles as *Chiesa*, *Dio*, *Imperatore*, *Sole*, *Virgilio*, in which we find noted every varied equivalent for the title word which Dante has anywhere employed. Mr. Toynbee has also followed a happy inspiration in grouping under the title '*Il*' Dante's frequent description of persons by means of that article followed by a word of designation: e.g. '*Il Cantor*,' '*Il Notaro*,' '*Il Pescatore*.' A similar arrangement is followed under such titles as *Colui*, *Quegli*, *Quei*, *Quel*, *Quella*, *Quelli*, *Quello*, *Sette*, and *Terra*. E.g. under '*Quegli ch' usurpa in terra il loco mio*' we find '*Bonifazio*,' and at once learn who is referred to. Proper names identical but belonging to different persons are printed repeatedly, each reprint being appropriated to one such person. The same treatment is applied to different persons described by one same avocation.<sup>2</sup> A very simple notation enables the reader to see at a glance whether a place or person is mentioned by name or by mere description; whether in a case where there is more than one mention of them they are or are not mentioned throughout by name or sometimes by description; and whether, in cases of mere description, the identity of the thing or

<sup>1</sup> She says of herself to Dante:

'La bellezza mia . . . per le scale  
Dell' eterno palazzo più s' accende,  
Com' hai veduto, quanto più si sale.'

Par. xxi. 7-9.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, the title '*Nocchiere*,' as to which we venture to suggest that there is an omission. Is not '*Il celestial Nocchiere*' (*Purg.* ii. 43) equally deserving of record as the infernal '*Nocchieri*,' Charon and Flegias?



person referred to is or is not a matter of conjecture. Lastly, there is an abundance of useful cross-references.

This index is in short a most worthy complement to the text, to which it is the unerring key. It very materially strengthens the obligation under which *The Oxford Dante* has laid all Dantophilists.

*Clerical Life and Work.* A collection of Sermons with an Essay. By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1894.)

THE Essay and all but two of the Sermons which this valuable book contains have already been separately published, and are probably well known to many of our readers. Not a few of those who possess them will be glad to have them in a collected form. And it is not merely a matter of convenience that the Essay and the Sermons should be included in this one volume. They are closely connected by a line of thought, and it is mentioned in the 'Advertisement' at the beginning that

'Dr. Liddon himself collected and arranged most of the Sermons, and chose the title under which they are now reprinted. It will be seen that they express the ideal of the clerical life that was before his mind from the earliest days of his ministry.'

From this point of view, regarding the various parts of the volume as the expression, under differing circumstances, of one definite principle of 'life and work,' it will be recognized as fitting that the Essay 'The Priest in his Inner Life' should be placed first. This Essay was published originally in two parts in the periodical *The Ecclesiastic and Theologian* for October 1856 and January 1857. It was afterwards included in a collection of articles called *The Spirit of the Church*. In 1869 it was reprinted and published, still anonymously, in a separate form. It has long been generally known to have been Dr. Liddon's work, and copies of it, printed since his death, have borne his name on the title-page. It is not too much to say that there must be many clergymen to whom this Essay has given an entirely new conception of the clerical life. Combining as it does a spiritual depth which under any circumstances would be remarkable, and which is the more to be wondered at when it is remembered that it was written at a time when the author had been a Priest for three years only, with accurate knowledge of theological truth and devotional methods, filled with the most earnest purpose and expressed with balance and vigour, it is well calculated both to strike the attention of any thoughtful mind and to mark permanently those who will think about it. That it should be recognized by many who have the work of the training of candidates for Holy Orders as one of their most useful instruments which they wish to see in the hands of all who are under their care, is only what a study of the Essay would lead us to expect.

It is, perhaps, less necessary now than it was in 1856 that the mere facts of the obligation of the recitation of the daily Office and

the necessity of systematic Meditation should be impressed upon the Clergy. But both of these are duties which are not to be satisfied by mere performance. If to omit the daily Office is to disobey the Church and to neglect a most important means of spiritual strength, and if to fail to use systematic Meditation is to invite languor and deadness in the soul, there is also a danger lest the saying of the Office be a mere formality and a Meditation be gone through without any communion of the heart with God. If the neglect of these duties is destructive, the performance of them needs much care. For the candidate for Holy Orders who has to learn the spirit with which he is to say his Office and make his Meditation, and for the Priest who needs to revive the devotional energy which he feels to be growing slack, the Essay is simply invaluable.

The value of the Essay is not exhausted by its teaching and suggestions on the subjects of the daily Office and systematic Meditation. Its sketch of 'the *dies sacerdotalis*—the clergyman's diary' (p. 41), its statement of the relation between the externals of religion and the inner condition of the soul, its words of warmth and wisdom on the whole spirit of the clerical life, are full of thoughts of power and usefulness, beautifully expressed, with which we could wish that every Deacon and Priest of the Church of England could become acquainted.

As the utility of the preliminary Essay has not been lost with the great increase since 1856 in the two practices with which it is chiefly concerned, so the first and second Sermons have not ceased to be useful because of changes which have been going on since they were preached in 1868 and 1873. It is no longer, indeed, necessary to take the same pains to defend the existence of theological Colleges as it was in those years. The time since has brought a rapidly growing recognition that the work of the Priesthood needs preparation of a very special kind. If the Clergy are to be teachers whether of the learned or of the ignorant, of the rich or of the poor, they must know, at least, their 'own great subject,'<sup>1</sup> and must have been students of that which they are to teach. And if they are to be able to bear the burden of the responsibilities of their work, and not to fail either in the help they owe to others or in their personal life, they must have trained their characters as well as their minds. That a theological College affords many advantages for such study and training is, as we have said, much more recognized now than it was even in 1873. But in the growth in the numbers of those who seek in these Colleges special study and training for their ministerial life and work, there cannot fail to be a danger lest the level be not so high as it was in the earlier days when that which is becoming customary was very uncommon. Popularity brings to every movement most serious risk, and it will be good for teachers and students alike to have Dr. Liddon's high ideals of clerical training freshly impressed upon their minds.

The seven Ordination Sermons which stand next in the volume exhibit the singular completeness of Dr. Liddon's teaching on the

<sup>1</sup> Church, *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 165.

great subject with which they have to do. The 'Example' of Christ as affording the 'strength of His Ministers,' the 'whole Counsel of God' as the truth which they have to declare, the gift of the Holy Ghost as the 'secret of clerical power,' the recognition of Providence in opposition to the 'fatalism' which denies 'the living God,' the 'moral value of a mission from Christ,' 'Clerical motives,' and the power of a 'common-place' life of 'faith without miracles,' are parts of it which are treated with characteristic power by Dr. Liddon's genius and learning and devotion. The last two of these Sermons have not been published before.

Of the two Sermons which follow, the first was preached at the Consecration of Bishop Venables as Bishop of Nassau in 1863. Its subject is 'Apostolic labours an evidence of Christian truth,' and it is marked by a profound conviction of the certainty of the victory of Christ and a spirit of hopefulness which may well have supplied encouragement to the Missionary Bishop as he went out to his work.<sup>1</sup>

'Now, as of old, He is crucified in weakness, while He reigns in power: He is, by the very pressure and fierceness of His foes, uniting friends who have long been sundered: His vast Providences enlist the services even of men who know but fragments of His truth: He has more loyal hearts who trust and worship Him than in any previous age: He has more tokens of present strength and of future victory than in the days when the kings of Europe were more ostentatiously the nursing-fathers of His Church, and its peoples more ready to own themselves her children' (p. 277).

The second of the two Consecration Sermons is well known under its title of 'A Father in Christ.' It was preached in 1885, at the consecration of Bishop King as Bishop of Lincoln and Bishop Bickersteth as Bishop of Exeter. It contains a magnificent description of the episcopal office and character, from which we may quote the passage in which Dr. Liddon speaks of the *jus magisterii*.

'Holding, as he should, in his mind and conscience the deposit of the true faith, his first duty is to see that it is taught to his flock—that it is taught in its integrity, that it is defended when assailed, that it is re-asserted in its purity when corrupted or disfigured. For he is not the versatile exponent of a human theory, but the keeper and teacher of a Revelation from God. He can neither reject an old doctrine nor welcome a new one; he can only decide whether a given doctrine which falls in his way is conformable or contrary to the truth which he holds and teaches, and which his spiritual children may expect at his hands. His intellectual outlook will indeed be wide; he will keep his eye, as far as may be, on all the surging currents of thought, along which souls are carried hither and thither in our distracted modern world; and as he will welcome from any quarter any ray of truth, so he will pay no feeble compliments to any shade of error. Before all things he will be

<sup>1</sup> The editor will do well to notice the odd words which are printed as Hebrew in note 1 on p. 269 of this Sermon before another edition is published. A similar mistake to one of these has also been made by the printer in note 2 on p. 140, and it would have been more uniform if 'ח' in note 1 on p. 137 had been pointed.

jealous for the honour of our Lord—His Eternal Godhead, His Incarnation in time, His infallibility as a Teacher, the Atoning Power of His Death, the literal truth of the Resurrection and Ascension and perpetual Intercession, the converting and sanctifying influence of His Spirit, the life-giving and life-sustaining power which He exerts through His Sacraments, the endlessness, for weal or woe, of the life to which He points, beyond the grave' (pp. 300-1).

The short Appendix which was printed with this Sermon in its separate form, and the long Preface which was prefixed to the second and subsequent editions, are not included in the present volume.

The three remaining Sermons are on Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, John Keble, and Edward Bouverie Pusey. That on Bishop Wilberforce notices at some length the Bishop's extraordinary powers of sympathy—

'that he could, without effort, and with the readiness and grace of a perfectly natural instinct, identify himself with human beings who agreed in almost nothing except the being human' (p. 321).

In commenting upon this strange power Dr Liddon is at some pains to defend the Bishop from charges of insincerity, which were actually made, and to point out that if he had had less care for truth he might have attained to a still higher position in the English Church than that which he held at the time of his death.

'High as was the position which he held at the time of his death, it was not that which the earlier opinion of his countrymen, or his vast practical abilities, or the unexampled scale and character of his public services, had long marked out for him. By common acknowledgment the natural chief of the English clergy, a man who maintained his ascendancy among his fellows with that careless ease which forbids the thought of rivalry, he must have known—nay, he knew—that he would have been carried by the popular voice to one of the two historic seats of honour and authority in the English Church, if he would only have consented to make popular prejudice the measure of his utterances. If he could have brought himself—they were nearly his own words—to ignore the spiritual character of the English Church, to treat her practically as a State department; to appeal to Acts of Parliament for her highest claims upon the conscience of the English people; if he could have sincerely echoed those popular depreciations of the Christian Sacraments which make them the barren and graceless symbols of an absent and shadowy Christ—the higher ecclesiastical honours could not, in the nature of things, have been withheld' (pp. 327-8).

It is unnecessary to dwell on the sympathetic force of the Sermons on Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey. Dr. Liddon is here on the most congenial ground, and the moral elevation of the Sermons is so high as to make their position in the volume on *Clerical Life and Work* singularly appropriate. We hope any of our readers who have not already done so will study them for themselves, but there are two significant passages we desire to quote:

'It was this same delicacy of mental texture which led Mr. Keble to pause reverently before Patristic reasonings, or principles of interpretation in which many modern critics have only discovered materials for ridicule. He used to dispute the assumptions of that phantom authority,

common-sense, on questions in which, if anything was to be decided at all seriously, it could only be by methods and after a patient investigation beyond the reach of the majority of men. He once brought a fluent critic of St. Ambrose as an interpreter of Scripture to a standstill by asking him what he should propose to say to an unbeliever who ridiculed the principle of St. Paul's allegorical argument about the two covenants in the Epistle to the Galatians. On another occasion he expressed himself as follows:—"People talk as if the Fathers, instead of arguing, wrote mere rhetoric: we want a monograph (that, I believe, is the modern word) to show that they were like the rest of us in meaning what they said, and, unlike the great majority of us in seeing a great deal further into Divine things than we at all suspect" (pp. 346-7).

'He' (Dr. Pusey) 'had in great perfection two natural qualities which go far to make an accomplished theologian. He combined with an intellectual sensitiveness, which rendered him alive to the claims of separate truths, and to distinctions between truths apparently similar, a remarkable sense of balance or proportion, which never allowed one truth to obscure in his mind the claims of another, and thus saved him from passing the line which separates the clear expression of very strong conviction from this or that kind of perilous exaggeration. This might, as I think, be shown by an examination of his most remarkable efforts in theology; or even of such sermons as those on the Holy Eucharist, on Absolution, on the Rule of Faith, on Darwinism—sermons which are of such a character as to form epochs, it is not too much to say, in our recent religious history.

'Of this knowledge Holy Scripture was the great source. To him the Bible was in fact, what to all of us it is in name, but to some of us only in name—the first of books. Intimately as he was acquainted with the great writers of Christian antiquity (to use his own words, he "lived for some years in St. Augustine"), he never lost sight of the vast interval which parts the sacred canon of Scripture from all other writings in the world. If you would know how he thought and felt in presence of the Sacred Text, read his Commentary on the Minor Prophets. If you would understand his jealous care for the claims of Scripture when assailed by modern unbelief, read his book on Daniel. He saw clearly that if Daniel was really written in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, if its author was really describing the past when he professed to be foretelling the future, the book was not merely an uninspired book, but a dishonest one. And therefore he put forth his whole strength to meet the infidel criticism on its own grounds; and in none of his writings—to omit other characteristics of this effort of his pen—do we see his scholarship more entirely at the disposal of theology' (pp. 360-1).

We can think of no better volume than this for the use of young men preparing for ordination, that they may gain some true idea of what their life and work should be; or, we will add, for clergy, young and old, to read and ponder over, in the hope of maintaining some of the earnestness and devotion with which Dr. Liddon himself was so deeply marked. For he was describing what he certainly had gone far towards attaining when he wrote in connexion with the daily use of the 119th Psalm at Prime and the three following hours:

'The 119th Psalm is at once infinitely varied in its expressions, yet incessantly one in its direction; its variations are so delicate as to be almost imperceptible, its unity so emphatic as to be inexorably stamped upon its every line; it is the language of the Catholic Church, gathered

out of every people, and nation, and tongue, and therefore so various, it is so apparently tautologous, because spoken beneath the very throne of God.

'Nothing, we believe, so expresses the true spirit of ecclesiastics as the 119th Psalm—the pure intention to live for God, the zeal for His glory, the charity for sinners, the enthusiastic love of the Divine law and the Divine perfections, the cheerfulness without levity, the gentleness without softness, the collectedness and gravity which is never stern or repulsive; in short, the inward and outward bearing of the Priest of Jesus Christ' (p. 41).

*Mr. Gladstone's Theology: the Article on the Atonement in the 'Nineteenth Century Review' of September 1894.* A Sermon on the above, preached in St. Alban's Church, Leamington, on Sunday evening, October 7, 1894. By the Rev. A. NICHOLSON, LL.D., Incumbent of St. Alban's. Published by request. (No place, publisher, or date given.)

THIS Sermon has been described by Mr. Gladstone as 'by far the most searching criticism' upon his article that he has seen. In it Dr. Nicholson, while admitting that the article upon which he is commenting contains many merits, describes it as a failure so far as the attempt to refute the charge of injustice brought against the Atonement is concerned. To show, he says, that sufferings often do good to those who suffer them, or that they frequently benefit others, or that apparently unjust sufferings are to be seen throughout the universe, does not afford any proof that the sufferings of Christ were no injustice to Him. 'Notwithstanding much that is good in the essay, clearly Mr. Gladstone has lost his case' (p. 12).

Dr. Nicholson has his own answer to the charge that the doctrine of the Atonement implies injustice to our Lord. He describes the objection as pointing 'to the injustice of the Almighty towards an innocent human person;' and since 'there is no human person in Christ,' it follows that 'there is no human person in the matter of the Atonement to receive injustice' (pp. 12-13). He goes on to say:

'The doctrine of the Incarnation is, that God the Son, of the same substance, majesty and glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the Divine Second Person in the undivided Trinity, God Almighty, takes into His Divine Person human nature without human person. In Christ we have to do not with two, but with one Person. This Divine Person, one in supreme will with the Father and the Spirit, deigns to suffer for us as to His human nature. The Almighty Judge and the Redeemer are one. The Divine Being does not remove the suffering from Himself to lay it upon another person. He takes it upon Himself as to His human nature. The charge that Almighty God in the Atonement treats any person with wrong and injustice is impossible, since there is no other *person* in the transaction. Almighty God, the Divine Word, is the one and only Person presented to us suffering as to the flesh' (p. 13).

To let go the truth of the single Personality of our Lord is to lose the power of appreciating the Atonement. The sacrifice of Christ has its value because that which is done in human nature is a Divine act. It is of service to men because the lack of a centre



of human personality in Him enables Him to be representative of mankind. If He were a human person as well as a Divine Person the ground of reconciliation would be gone. And His enduring suffering in order that He may not have to inflict eternal punishment is bound up with the truth that in all He does as Man it is God the Word, essentially One with the Father, who acts.

So far we are in entire agreement with Dr. Nicholson as to the importance of the truth to which we have referred in its bearing on the Atonement; but we doubt whether the truth can be used exactly as he uses it. To say that there is no injustice since there is no human person to whom injustice can be done is to ignore the possibility of an argument in reply that injustice is done by God the Father to the Divine Person of God the Son. There is further needed an explanation of the bearing on the Atonement of the unity of will which is the necessary outcome of the unity of the Essence of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity.

We are not among those who expect that our human faculties can ever in this life possess full apprehension of the mysteries of the attributes of God. But we think that an appreciation of the doctrine of the single Personality of Christ, presented in a somewhat different way from that in which Dr. Nicholson presents it, and with the connexion of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity with the Atonement more fully shown than in the brief indication contained in the words 'one in supreme will with the Father and the Spirit' (p. 13), sheds such light upon this particular question as we have any right to expect.

The Sermon is of great interest and ability. We think the materials employed in it could have been used with greater effect.

*The Word and the Way: or the Light of the Ages on the Path of To-day.* By WILLIAM LEIGHTON GRANE, M.A., Rector of Bexhill, Sussex. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

THIS is a book of very distinct ability. It consists of four parts, under the titles of 'The Word of Life,' 'The Way of Life,' 'Stones of Stumbling,' 'Staves of Help.' The subjects of the different parts are thus described in the preface:

'The subject of the first part is the Light of Divine Revelation given to mankind with gradually increasing clearness, in every age, but especially in Holy Writ and in the life of Jesus Christ. . . . The second part treats of "The Way of Life," and seeks to illustrate and emphasize some of the leading characteristics of Christianity. Since, however, those of us who are "admitted into the fellowship of Christ's Religion" only too often feel "much discouraged because of the Way," the concluding parts discuss certain hindrances to be overcome and helps to be used in making the journey of life' (Preface, p. v).

The tone and aim of the book are excellent. Mr. Grane's object is to commend the old Faith of Christianity in ways that will appeal to the minds and consciences of the present day. He is full of faith in the truth of God's Revelation and in the power of man, by Divine grace, to live by its light. His teaching on the claims of the

Example of Christ, and on the possibility of imitating it, on the practical influence of Christ's Life, on the power and happiness of rest in God, on the need of moral effort and unselfish conduct, and on many matters of everyday life is true and encouraging.

Yet there is much against which, in commending this volume for many excellences, we are bound to protest. The writer needs to possess a much clearer apprehension of the true distinction between Holy Scripture and all other books, a much stronger sense of objective authority lodged in the Bible and the Church, sounder criticism and methods of interpretation of the Old and the New Testament. He is prone to confusions of thought in such matters as the relation between Regeneration and Conversion, the duty of Christians in the work of saving their own souls, the place of the desire for happiness and the use of asceticism in human life.

The various chapters appear to have been preached as sermons. It is difficult for us to imagine congregations to whom they can have been useful as they stand. But, as a book to be read and thought about by those who are conscious of its limitations, and able to detect its mistakes, it is likely to prove both of intellectual suggestiveness and moral help.

*Lessons in Thought and Prayer; being Short Daily Exercises upon Catholic Faith and Practice.* By RICHARD TRAVERS SMITH, D.D., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's and Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin. (London: Skeffington and Co., 1895.)

THE name of Dr. Travers Smith will be known to our readers in connexion with his earnest struggles in Ireland in the cause of true Churchmanship, and they will expect to find that a book from his pen is based upon the authorized theology of the Catholic Church, and full of practical power. Those who have such anticipations will not be disappointed in the present work. The task of suggesting methods and thoughts for the practice of Meditation is one of great responsibility. The extent to which Meditation marks the mind and the whole life can hardly be exaggerated. How effective an instrument it was made by 'that great educator, Ignatius Loyola,' is pointed out by Dr. Smith (Preface, p. v). Its power has been a matter of frequent experience ever since. It is, then, of the highest importance that the methods of Meditation should be such as are calculated to strengthen and not to weaken the soul, to lead it away from merely human help to a growing dependence upon and closeness of communion with God; and that the thoughts suggested are true and uplifting and bracing and practical. We have too much of sentimental devotion, which fulfils neither the object of leading the soul to close and personal communion with God, nor that of practically affecting the performance of the ordinary duties of life. Dr. Smith's little book is full of suggestive thought, but it leaves a great deal to be worked out by those who use it for themselves. It will afford no help to devotional laziness which is unwilling to make any spiritual effort; it will be of great usefulness to those who are ready to spend pains upon their prayers.

The plan of the work is explained in the Preface :

'The writer has not taken advantage of the attitude of his reader's mind to force upon him thoughts which are not genuine points of Catholic truth. Nor are the suggested expansions so elaborate as to relieve anyone of the trouble of framing some thoughts for himself. If they should differ from those of the author, that will not spoil his hope of promoting thought and prayer; perhaps of a better kind than those which had occurred to himself. There are here some subjects which are not usually considered fit for meditation, and some which may suggest controversy. But nothing which the Church makes a part of her faith and practice can be unfit for the meditation of one of her children: and controversy would be deprived of much of its evil if those who engage in it had previously thought and prayed on the matter they were about to discuss.

'The plan is simple. The part of the year between Epiphany and Lent is devoted to the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. The period from Easter to Trinity is occupied with the Church and its ordinances, and that from Trinity to Advent with a progressive series of subjects from the Bible' (Preface, pp. v, vi).

Our readers may like to see specimens of the thoughts and prayers. The following are those for the Feasts of the Circumcision of our Lord and the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary :

'The Circumcision.

The Lord entered on pain almost as soon as on life.

Yet not upon the sorrow of the world, but that of godliness.

The hopeful pain that comes from nearness to God.

O God, give me the grace of patience which worketh experience.

And to learn the lesson that through much tribulation we enter the kingdom.

And to look for comfort and help to the pain-bearing of Christ' (p. 7).

'The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

This is the feast of the Incarnation, though Christmas naturally takes that place.

The Son of God submitted to that mysterious development before birth.

How much glory did the Annunciation bring to Mary: yet how much humiliation and submission.

My God, the Blessed Virgin then answered for the race, and accepted the blessed gift of salvation.

O that I might accept it with the same humble faith as she!

Her true honour was to be the faithful human receiver of a divine blessing' (p. 208).

We hope that so good a book may have the wide circulation that it deserves; and we should gladly welcome a sequel from the same pen which would give similar treatment, on a complete and continuous plan, of the life and words of our Lord.

*What is Worship?* Tracts on Church Doctrine, No. 21. By D. J. WHITE, Vicar of Burgh, Lincolnshire, and Rural Dean. (London: G. J. Palmer and Sons [no date].)

THIS is a very useful tract explaining what worship is, and making suggestions as to the way in which it is to be offered. We are glad

to notice the emphasis laid by the writer on the need of reverence, on the special aspect of almsgiving when forming part of Divine Service, and on the position of the Holy Eucharist as the great act of Christian worship.

'In proportion to our sense of reverence will be the reality of our worship; and where reverence is wanting, the idea of worship is almost entirely lost' (p. 4).

'It is a good thing to give subscriptions for the support of good objects according to our means; but it is surely a far better thing to make our almsgiving a regular part of our worship in Church, and especially at the Holy Eucharist, the great Service of thanksgiving and praise' (pp. 6-7).

'The Holy Eucharist is the divinely ordained Service of Worship in the Christian Church. What the ancient Sacrifices were to the Patriarchs and the Jewish people, the Holy Eucharist is to faithful Christians now. It is their central Act of worship. . . . A Sunday without the Holy Eucharist is a Sunday without "Worship" in the highest and truest sense of the word' (pp. 6-7).

We hope the tract may have a wide circulation among those whom it is designed to teach and help.

*Christianity and the Roman Government: a Study in Imperial Administration.* By E. G. HARDY, M.A., formerly Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894.)

IN the edition of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan which Mr. Hardy published a few years ago, he was naturally led to discuss at some length the relation of the Christians to the Roman Empire. His treatment of the matter called for some adverse criticism at the time, and since then Professor Mommsen has published an important article, in which he brings his unrivalled knowledge of the Roman Administration to bear on this difficult matter. Mr. Hardy has therefore done well to publish this little book, in which he subjects the whole matter to a fresh discussion, and, guided by Mommsen's work, comes to conclusions which differ in several important points from those that he maintained in the earlier work.

We have no space here to discuss the respective merits of all the various theories which have been mentioned by Lightfoot, Ramsay, Arnold, Schiller, and others. Mr. Hardy, however, seems to us to be right when, following Mommsen, he lays stress on the fact that the 'persecutions' in Rome, and in fact elsewhere, were, during the first century and a half, a matter of police regulation, and that there was at this period at least no general policy pursued or principles adopted by the different emperors. That the Christians were originally regarded by the Romans as merely an unimportant Jewish sect is clear from the narrative of the Acts. Some writers have gone farther, and maintained that the Neronian persecution was directed against the Jews, and that Tacitus in his account of the matter was influenced by the knowledge which had been gained in his time, and especially by the experience of Pliny. Mr. Hardy rightly rejects this view, which in his earlier work he defended. All the evidence

seems to support the belief that, from the time of Nero, Christians as Christians were subject to the danger of being summoned before the magistrates and punished. Under what law was this? What was the offence with which they were charged? Mr. Hardy argues that they were punished not for crimes imputed to them, but because of the simple fact of their Christianity: they suffered for the name; the refusal to sacrifice to the Emperor, or to some idol, was not the offence, it was a test—a test which, as is pointed out, was adopted at first from motives of clemency and justice. Experience showed that real Christians refused to sacrifice. Anyone, therefore, who was unjustly accused could exculpate himself easily, and the magistrate had a welcome pretext for pardoning those who, though 'guilty,' were not 'obstinate.' The Christians were persecuted not as traitors or as magicians, but simply as Christians, as members of a body which was notoriously incompatible with the good order and obedience to existing institutions which an efficient police administration required from all.

We do not ourselves see much difficulty in understanding why this was so. First, it must be remembered that the Roman government was well-organised and well-informed: all governors of provinces were in constant communication with the Imperial offices. The rapid spread of Christianity must soon have been brought to their notice. The character of the Emperor made far less difference than was formerly supposed to the ordinary administration. But if once the government was brought to inquire into the nature of Christianity, it was inevitable that it should desire to check the growth of the body. Mr. Hardy says that at this period the Christians were not a danger to the State, and neither Nero nor Domitian could possibly have thought that they were, or have ordered systematic measures of repression on that ground. This is only half true; the government seems from the beginning to have taken up the view that, from the evidence before it, Christian opinions were to this extent dangerous, that if they became common they would overthrow society; the danger was not serious, but it was present. Mommsen compares the laws against Christians with those against brigands; they were always in reserve to be used when necessary; they were used whenever the police officials thought desirable. At the end of the second century, when the real struggle for power between the Church and the Empire was beginning, Christianity was regarded as a public and open enemy of the State. In the earlier days it was looked on as we regard Anarchism—as a dangerous social disease. Renan has justly pointed out that it was doubtless the avowed belief in the speedy end of the world which caused this. No doubt, too, the Roman government was right: if we can imagine, knowing what we do, that a large proportion of the population had adopted the Christian faith before the organisation of the Church had been completed, and while the belief in the immediate end of the world was still common, would not the whole fabric of social life—the army, the courts of justice, the provisioning of Rome, the punishment of robbers—all have been destroyed? This

VOL. XXXIX.—NO. LXXVIII.

M M

must much more have been the sober opinion of every Roman, and was the opinion on which the government acted. What to a Roman magistrate must have been the greatest crime was what Pliny calls *obstinatio*. Implicit obedience to every command was required from all who were not Roman citizens; it was the condition on which the Empire existed; it was impossible to allow the existence of a class of men who were known to refuse to obey commands, not unreasonable in themselves, for no apparent reason.

At the end of the book will be found a short appendix on two 'Acta Martyrum,' which have been recently discovered, which are of great interest as illustrating the procedure in the trials of Christians. One of these speaks of an 'Edict' of the Senate. This, Mr. Hardy assumes, refers to a special edict passed on this particular occasion—an explanation which the language hardly justifies. It seems rather to refer to some general regulation of that body; there is nothing *a priori* improbable in the existence of a *senatus consultum*, regulating the trials for Christianity.

The work is a useful one for English readers, as it contains a good deal of information which is not generally accessible; a little more attention to style would have made it more agreeable to read.

*A History of Rome to the Battle of Actium.* By EVELYN SHIRLEY SHUCKBURGH, M.A. With Maps and Plans. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

THIS is a history of Rome from the beginning to the battle of Actium in one volume of about 800 pages. At the end of each chapter is a short account of the authorities for the period with which it deals; there are a full table of contents, a well-arranged index, and several sketch-maps; frequent marginal headings and dates make it easy to use the book for reference; type and printing are good. It seems, in fact, to have all the external requirements of a good textbook. Turning to the more important matter of the narrative itself, this is, at all places where we have tested it, correct and full. Mr. Shuckburgh does not unduly thrust before the student modern controversies, but he shows that he is well acquainted with the results of research and has incorporated them. He devotes perhaps less space than is usual to constitutional matters; but we think he is justified, for, as he says in his preface, the history of Rome must be one of wars and conquests.

In the earlier part of the book he keeps closer to the traditional narrative than is now customary. It is perhaps true that a book intended for schools ought to contain a summary of the earlier books of Livy; it would, however, certainly have been better to distinguish more clearly than he does between the clearly mythical narrative of the Seven Kings and the account of, *e.g.*, the reforms of Servius Tullius. We doubt whether a boy, after reading the book, would understand that the fact of the existence of the *Leges Regiæ* and of the early constitution of the Senate can be believed independently of the traditions connected with them in the popular account. In the account of the conquest of Italy we miss a formal and clear explana-



tion of the various classes of towns ; the organization of Italy is the great secret of Rome's growth, and is the most difficult matter to explain to beginners. We doubt whether a student using this book will quite appreciate the importance of the matter, or understand clearly the position of the various classes of towns at different periods. There is, *e.g.*, nothing to inform him that the 'Latin citizens' were really allies, and served in the army as allies. We notice one passage that (p. 215) implies that the allies served in the legion. We should have liked to see a simple sketch-map of Italy, showing all the roads, colonies, and their chief towns ; for this we would willingly have sacrificed some of those that we have.

The account of military operations seems clear and correct ; the description of the conquest of the East is fuller and better than is customary in books of this size. We have noticed many places in which more care might be expended on the style. Mr. Shuckburgh often seems to forget that, however well known a fact is to himself, his readers will be completely ignorant of it ; even at the risk of baldness, every fact ought to be narrated distinctly and simply. One instance will show what we mean. When the Senate wished to declare war against Philip of Macedonia in 200 the Comitia refused to pass the vote ; this is a very striking episode. Mr. Shuckburgh never really says what happened ; he explains (p. 427) that the war 'was not popular,' that 'it was difficult to persuade the people,' and that 'they were induced to cancel the vote forbidding the war.' Now no one but a trained and careful reader would ever notice that anything unusual had happened, and he would have to go elsewhere to discover whether his conjecture was true. Another similar fault will be noticed on p. 693, where, in quoting the well-known saying about the 'three fortunes' that the governor of a province had to make, he relegates the epigram to the margin, and in the text puts only the explanation. We notice, too, other places where the marginal heading seems to refer to something he had meant to explain but has not, as on p. 583, where (referring to Marius's army reforms) the ungrammatical note, 'Effect of refining,' is apposed to the equally ungrammatical sentence, 'Other reforms attributed to him were, in matters of detail, for the comfort and efficiency of the soldiers.'

We notice these points, because in a text-book it is most important that there should be absolute clearness and accuracy of expression. The book is a good one ; it will be very useful ; and we hope that when a fresh issue is published the author will carefully remove all small blemishes of this kind, for, small though they appear to be, we know by experience how much they detract from the value of a work which is meant to be used by boys and undergraduates. Moreover, the teaching of history ought to be one of the means for teaching English, a fact which writers of text-books would do well to remember.

*A Chapter of Church History from South Germany; being Passages from the Life of Johann Evangelist Georg Lutz, formerly Parish Priest and Dean in Oberroth, Bavaria.* By L. W. SCHOLLER. Translated from the German by W. WALLIS. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894.)

'THE book of which the following pages are a translation was intended, primarily, for those persons who believe in the Divine character of a work which has been going on in the Church for the last sixty years; which work commenced in the remanifestation, as they believe, of the gifts and powers of the Holy Ghost, and issued in the calling and sending forth of apostles, and in the gathering of the believers into congregations, whose special calling is to "be mindful of the words spoken by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of the apostles of the Lord."

'In like manner, the book, in its English garb, is intended, primarily, for those who have the above faith; but the translator hopes that it may be of interest to a wider circle of readers.

'The history of a real spiritual revival occurring within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church, under the most unfavourable circumstances, and yet resulting in great and permanent blessing to very many, must be a matter of interest to all who desire to see a revival of spiritual life and energy in our own land' (pp. vii, viii).

This quotation from the Preface will explain better than any words of ours would do the nature and object of this work, as well as the style in which it is written. It is the life of a German Roman Catholic priest, who eventually became an adherent of what is generally known as the Irvingite Church. We will confess that, judging it without any prejudice, we do not find the story an attractive one. Johann Lutz, who was born in 1801, was in due time ordained and, in 1826, appointed to the cure of Karlshuld, a lonely and neglected village in the midst of a great moor on the Upper Danube, one of the marshes which had been reclaimed by the government of Montgelas. His appointment was soon followed by a great change in the habits of the people, who had before been notorious not only for their misery, but also for their coarseness and immorality. This change was accompanied by scenes of the kind so common in 'revivals.' What would appear to mark the difference between this and other similar work was the presence of what the author calls 'spiritual gifts.' It will be well to quote the passage describing this.

'It was at this time—that is to say, at the end of February 1828—that some persons, a man and two women, commenced suddenly to speak under the influence of a higher power. This was new to Lutz, and quite unexpected by him. He asked the persons what it was that was passing in them. They answered, "We know nothing of that which we utter until we commence to speak; a power comes upon us, and the words which we are to speak are given to us." Lutz knew these persons to be both faithful and conscientious, and therefore he believed what they told him, and received in faith the words which were spoken through them. Words of the Spirit were spoken both in the church and in the houses. The first word spoken in the power was the following: "Know ye not, ye children of God, that ye are living in the last days, in the days in which the Lord will come. Know ye not that before the Lord comes

He will give again apostles, prophets, evangelists and pastors, and churches as at the beginning?"

"It is very much to be regretted that no record was kept of the words which for a long time continued to be spoken in the church. In addition to the words above mentioned, the following are some which Lutz remembered: "Ye are living in the time when Jesus will awake the sleeping ones." "The first resurrection is near. This generation shall live to see it." The words, "This generation shall live to see it," and "The Lord gives again apostles and churches as at the beginning," were often repeated. . . . It was constantly said, "Search ye the Scriptures," and very often the passage they were to search for was indicated to them. They were also exhorted by the words of the Spirit to value the sacraments. Holy Baptism was to be honoured as the laver of regeneration. . . . It was told them that the Lord Himself would gather a church out of the different confessions, in which He would fulfil all the good pleasure of His will, and until then they were to remain quiet and to wait' (pp. 30-32).

These 'manifestations' are recorded as a prophecy of that society to which the author belongs. At the time they seem to have been regarded with no great pleasure by the priest. But though he took no part in and expressed little sympathy with the 'prophecies,' he had started on a course which inevitably led to a separation from the Roman Church; demands were made for the reception of the Communion in both kinds, and for other important alterations in the conduct of the church services. The attention of the authorities was drawn to the case. They seem to have acted then, and indeed throughout the whole affair, with great tact, moderation, and kindness. Lutz, against whom no direct charge was proved, was removed from his cure, but promoted to another more important parish, and awarded the Civil Order of Merit by the government, in consequence of his exertions during a famine. He, however, attempted to resist, protested against his removal, although it had been arranged in the most honourable manner for him, and when his protest was rejected began to form a separate congregation. Leave to do this was forbidden by the government (in Bavaria there was toleration only of such sects as had a formal licence to carry on worship), and in consequence he eventually decided to join the Protestant or Lutheran Church. In it he did not remain long; it was a time when German Protestantism was still under the dominion of rationalism. In conversation with a 'Consistorial Rath,' Lutz discovered that one of the rulers of the Protestant Church did not believe in the Divinity of Christ. He had been deceived: he recognised that 'he had gone from bad to worse,' and he at once took the necessary steps for retracting. He made a full recantation, publicly avowed his adherence to the teaching of the Council of Trent, and was received again into the Roman Catholic Church. He brought back with him many of those who had left it with him. He then again became a parish priest, 'regained the confidence of his superiors,' and within ten years rose to be archdeacon and rural dean. In this position he seems to have been doing valuable work, both on the spiritual and

material sides ; he might have looked forward to a very honourable and beneficent career. In 1842 he was visited by a Mr. William Caird, an emissary of the 'Apostolic Church.' By him Lutz was apparently converted ; we say 'apparently,' for he seems for many years to have thought it possible to hold the position he had in the Roman Church at the same time that he gave a not very decided assent to the new doctrines, a course which his biographer seems to think was both logical and honourable. The result was inevitable : after repeated inquiries and prolonged investigations, after warnings and reprimands, deprivation and excommunication followed, and he ended his days a member of the body he had joined. He lived for many years in Switzerland, and afterwards travelled on missionary journeys through Germany, preaching the new teaching.

We will confess that the story seems to us to be a warning and not an example ; it is in this work told without any of the power or charm which might have given a permanent interest to what we cannot but consider to be the melancholy record of a wasted life.

*Belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ.* By the Rev. Father DIDON, of the Order of Saint Dominic. (London : Kegan Paul and Co., 1894.)

No indication is given in this English edition of Father Didon's lectures of the name of the translator, and we are perhaps intended to infer that the author himself translated them for English readers. An occasional slip interrupts the smoothness of an idiom, and strengthens the impression that the translator either was not an Englishman, or was drawn by a strong attraction into the style of his author. This is noticeable in the idiomatic use of the article which sometimes follows the French instead of the English mode, and in the use of wrongly-connected phrases like 'the former' and 'the second' (p. 145). But for the most part the sentences run smoothly, and do not obscure the brilliance of the preacher's thought. In a preface addressed 'to the pupils of the schools of Albert le Grand, La Place, and Lacordaire' (p. v), the author explains his design, and prepares us for the high-spirited manner in which he handles his subject. The arguments are clothed in the splendour of rhetorical language, and are presented in a form not for the students of technical theology at the Sorbonne—where, as Father Didon admits, an opinion 'may be dismissed or changed from day to day' (p. 20)—but for 'everybody,' because the congregation which assembled at the Church of the Madeleine was composed of all sorts and conditions of people. The first lecture reviews 'the present state of the belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ,' and comes to the conclusion that this belief attests its indomitable vitality by its power of lasting and its vigour for expansion and resistance. 'We are the progressives, we who believe in Jesus Christ. They who prophecy our ruin, decay and die' (p. 4). Father Didon is of opinion that 'in England the Catholic faith, faith in Jesus Christ, is extending and developing' (p. 17). In the next two lectures the present state of the denial of our Lord's divinity, and the worth of that denial, are con-

sidered. Compared with the denials of previous ages, Jewish, Gnostic, Arian, Mohammedan, Socinian, and Deistic, the contemporary denial is characterized in the eyes of the French preacher by a desire to suppress God everywhere (p. 38). There is almost a recognition of God in the activity of that word suppression: at all events disdain would be more logical. But the denials of other ages passed away, as all else that is human and at the mercy of the fleeting spirit of the age passes away, and this new impatient denial 'will join the others' (p. 55). In estimating its worth Father Didon makes a point before his French audience which wins our admiration for his skill and humour. He regrets to be obliged to recognize that in the vast work of suppressing the Divinity in the authentic documents in which it is recorded France is the servant of Germany, and the French infidels borrow their weapons from German scholars (p. 57). He notes this by way of preface, and then having attuned the ear of his hearers to his song, he proceeds to employ the argument of Tertullian in *De Præscriptione Hereticorum*, that the Bible is the book of the Church, and that those who ignore the Church have not only no right to interpret Holy Scripture, but are radically incapacitated from the work of interpreting it because they do not possess the spirit which alone can unlock its mysteries. The next two lectures rise to a great height of eloquence and excellence. They treat of the testimony of our Lord Himself as the chief reason for the belief in His Divinity, and of the worth of that testimony when it is considered in relation to His moral goodness. English readers are familiar with this line of argument from Dr. Young's work on *The Christ of History* and from the Bampton Lectures of 1866, and they will not be slow to recognize the power with which Father Didon handles the theme, and the triumph with which he refutes the hallucination theory on p. 138. But we think that he might have made his position, we do not say stronger, but more widely effective, by a different mode of defence in the matter of the meaning of the phrase 'the Son of God.' He takes the line that Son must imply Son in a unique essential sense because the Church has always said so, and undoubtedly this is a proper argument to put before men who are prepared to accept the witness, if not the authority, of the Church. But Father Didon professes that he is addressing unbelievers, and unbelievers are not disposed to accept so much as that to start with, especially so much as the Roman branch of the Catholic Church requires them to accept. An argument which could command their assent without this large preliminary admission would be much preferable. And it is forthcoming, for the records of the Lord's life show that the contemporaries of His life on earth quite understood that He claimed to be the Son of God in a unique sense, and they proved it against themselves by making the charge of blasphemy. A chapter on 'the seven words of Jesus on the Cross' is interpolated between what are really the two concluding lectures of the series, the first on the difficulties of the act of faith in our Lord's Divinity, and the second on the practical means for its exercise. Foremost among the difficulties of belief Father Didon notices the undoubted fact that acceptance of the

truth of our Lord's Godhead logically carries with it a complete surrender. He who really believes is the slave of Christ, and this seems hard to those who do not yet know that there is a service which is perfect freedom, there is *One cui servire regnare est*. This difficulty runs through all the varieties of difficulties which are felt by those whose life service is classed under the headings of mind, or heart, or material activity or unruly instincts, and Father Didon pursues it under these various heads in many fruitful ways. His great piece of practical advice, and it is all the more significant from the lips of a Dominican priest, is, 'Read the Gospel, not with your critical spirit, nor with your poet's imagination, but with your conscience' (p. 215). And again, 'I ask you to put yourselves in a personal and direct relation with [Jesus Christ]' (p. 214). The preacher loves France dearly, and with the spirit of a true patriot he tells her many stern and wholesome truths if in her present unhappy state she is not too deaf to hear them. And if in England there is less open hatred of the Crucified, it must not be forgotten that we, too, need a warning against 'the atrophy of the religious sense' which Father Didon ranks among 'the sorrows of our time' (p. 165). We must briefly notice a few errors, and a few points on which we should desire some alteration. We are often told that it is only by popular uneducated Roman Catholics that language is used about the Lord's Mother which infringes upon the infinite majesty of her Divine Son, but nothing could encourage such language more than the loose way in which Father Didon uses the epithet 'divine' of the Lord's Mother on pp. 182, 184. We should also hesitate to say in reference to the cry, 'Eli, Eli,' that Jesus was 'repulsed by His Father' even with the surrounding cautions of p. 190. A well-known story about Julian told in Theod. iii. 23 is apparently quoted secondhand, for it is inaccurately told on p. 54. There is a curious instance, too, of the want of familiarity with details of the Bible which is sometimes shown in Roman Catholic writers. Not only does Father Didon by a slip ignore the duration of our Lord's earthly life by speaking of His crucifixion as taking place 'eighteen hundred and ninety-four years ago,' but he says, in spite of St. Mark xv. 25, that Jesus was raised up on the Cross at the 'sixth' hour (p. 170). In a few places the type has been allowed to slip, and there is a misprint on p. 177.

*Symbolism, or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings.* By JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, D.D. Translated from the German by JAMES BURTON ROBERTSON. (London: Gibbings and Co., 1894.)

WE are not at all sure that the publishers have done wisely in issuing this reprint of Moehler's work. It is the reprint, apparently, of the English translation made from the fifth German edition of 1838, after the author's death. The English title is confusing, especially among this series of publications, because 'Symbolism,' in the sense of doctrinal confessions, is not an English idea. It is clear enough in Greek and Latin, probably also in German, but in English 'Sym-



bolism' has a mystical or allegorical meaning, and is not applied to Creeds. The book itself is out of date, very heavy in style, and not interesting to English Churchmen, because it deals with a Continental Protestantism which has nearly disappeared. Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians are, as a rule, no longer faithful to their original confessions of faith, but are fast becoming Socinians, Rationalists, and Agnostics. The antagonism between the Reformed religion on the Continent and Roman Catholicism is no longer maintained with that activity which appears to have existed in Tübingen about the year 1832, when these lectures were first delivered. The antagonism of the last years of this century is rather between the faith as represented on the Continent chiefly by the Roman Communion, and unbelief or Rationalism as represented by the Protestant sects. It is otherwise in England; and Moehler's ignorance of the real position of the English Church renders this book of comparatively little value at this time to English Churchmen. Here and there, indeed, the Anglican Communion is mentioned, but no attempt is made to deal with her position as different from Continental forms of Protestantism. She is classed with Calvinism and Zwinglianism (pp. 18, 19), though her maintenance of episcopacy is acknowledged, and her liturgy pronounced to be 'more approximating to that of the Catholic Church;' but her Thirty-nine Articles are reckoned among Calvinistic formularies. If Moehler had read Archbishop Laurence's *Bampton Lectures* (1804) he would scarcely have made this mistake. However, the English Church is given the credit (p. 20) of having 'formally rejected' the decrees of Dort. In the second part of the book, where the Quakers and the Methodists are dealt with, the writer shows his acquaintance with standard English works, e.g. Clarkson's *Portraiture of Quakerism* and Southey's *Life of Wesley*; and of the former sect he gives an interesting and accurate account, but of the latter as much cannot be said. He depends too much on Southey, and does not appreciate Wesley's genuine Churchmanship, and does not appear to know how emphatically before his death he urged his followers not to separate themselves from the Church. We read (p. 442), 'The separation from the Anglican Church was now formally proclaimed, and the most strenuous opposition commenced.' Yet in a note it is remarked that 'there were Methodists who adhered to the Established Church.' This shows that Moehler did not understand John Wesley's position. As a book of reference we have no doubt that Moehler's work will continue to be used, and there are copies to be found in most libraries: it is never likely to be read by students in the way that it once was. And yet subjects are touched upon which must always be worth studying, especially those points where the English Church differs from the Roman Communion. Chapters iv. and v. of the first part ought to be read in order to get at the Roman position as it was before the later additions to the faith in 1854 and 1870; and in the second part, besides the accounts of the Quakers and Moravians and Methodists, the chapter on Socinianism deserves study, especially as the tendency of Protestantism, where there is no episcopate to control, and no Catholic Creed to

check, and where the Sacraments are lightly esteemed, is towards Socinianism, and eventually towards unbelief.

The English Churchman will read with some surprise the following passages concerning the Roman Church :

'For the unseemliness of the congregation no longer communicating every Sunday (as was the case in the Primitive Church), and of the priest in the Mass usually receiving alone the Body of the Lord, is not to be laid to the blame of the Church (for all the prayers in the holy sacrifice presuppose the sacramental communion of the entire congregation), but is to be ascribed to the tepidity of the greater part of the faithful' (p. 243).

'Lastly, in the Catholic Church the custom prevails of receiving communion only under one kind—a matter, as is evident, belonging to discipline and not to doctrine' (p. 249). 'However, we should rejoice if it were left free to each one to drink or not of the consecrated chalice; and this permission would be granted, if with the same love and concord an universal desire were expressed for the use of the cup as, from the twelfth century, the contrary wish has been enounced' (p. 250).

*The Great Reconciliation and the Reign of Grace.* By EDWARD SEELEY, Vicar of The Martyrs, Leicester. (London: Elliot Stock, 1893.)

THIS book, as the title suggests, deals with the doctrine of the Atonement, but the word itself, so wide and comprehensive in its etymology, 'At-one-ment,' is employed in a narrow and limited sense as meaning 'sacrifice for sin,' because of its Old Testament associations, while the word used in the Revised Version, viz. 'Reconciliation,' is employed throughout to express the larger idea. This has the advantage of bringing Romans v. 11 into line with 2 Corinthians v. 18-20, but it seems a pity to narrow down the theological sense of the familiar word 'Atonement' just as we have begun to make people understand what it means. Still, this is a small point compared with Mr. Seeley's treatment of the whole subject. The book is far too elaborate, too formal, too scholastic for the general reader, while for the student, the absence of the accepted theological terms, of references to standard authorities and ancient testimony, and the words of the Greek text, make the book of comparatively little value. The doctrine of our Lord's Person and of the Incarnation, are clearly put forth, and the Inspiration of Holy Scripture is taken for granted; but we look in vain for any recognition of the authority and teaching of the Catholic Church, and especially of the necessity of the Sacraments for the application of the benefits of Christ's sacrifice to the souls of the faithful. The whole argument turns upon 2 Corinthians v. 18-20; the 'great reconciliation' is rightly founded upon the words, 'God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ,' and 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself;' 'the lesser reconciliation' (chap. xxv.) is regarded as consisting in 'Be ye reconciled to God;' but our author has deliberately ignored that reconciliation of which the Apostle speaks so emphatically, viz. 'and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation' (ver. 19), and 'hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation' (ver. 18). This treatise keeps out of

sight  
Apos  
as e  
woul  
v. 19  
ciliat  
the s  
part  
recog  
Absc  
sacra  
what  
soun  
Holy  
the A  
for C  
We t  
arran  
treat  
of th  
the  
repe  
part.  
'Tha  
(see  
men  
48)  
Aton  
we  
(p. r

Fall

It i  
gain  
he i  
belie  
but  
not  
to th  
rejec  
that  
exist  
'ang  
of m  
the  
rega  
hold

sight the ministry of God's word and sacraments, although the Apostle speaks of God's ministers as 'ambassadors for Christ,' and as entreating men 'in Christ's stead.' We would that Mr. Seeley would read Dr. Liddon's University Sermon upon this passage (2 Cor. v. 19); he certainly would not have written as if this 'lesser reconciliation' consisted only 'of repentance towards God on the part of the sinner, and of forgiveness of sins and a gracious welcome on the part of the Heavenly Father' (p. 232); for he leaves out of sight all recognition of the forgiveness of sins in Baptism and of the grace of Absolution for sins after Baptism. This ignoring of the Church's sacramental system, and, indeed, of all reference to the Eucharist, is what we should hardly expect from one who shows himself to be sound in the faith concerning our Lord's Person and the work of the Holy Spirit. The Church is evidently nothing in his conception of the Atonement; it is a matter between the individual and his God for Christ's sake, and is appropriated by the sinner through faith only. We thought we had got rid of this narrow system of theology. The arrangement of the book is not an ideal one; the reconciliation is treated of (1) in respect of man, (2) in respect of God, (3) in respect of the One Mediator, but the writer is conscious of 'an inversion of the proper order' (p. 20); and this leads to a needless amount of repetition in the second part of what has already been said in the first part. We think that too much has been made of Ephesians i. 9, 10, 'That . . . He might gather together in one all things in Christ' (see pp. 2 and 45, 47), as if it involved the planning of the Atonement before the Fall; we dislike very much the expression (pp. 45, 48) 'a prearranged remedy for a foreseen Fall,' because it makes the Atonement appear like a dramatic display on the part of God. And we know of no Scriptural ground for the 'probation' of Angels (p. 13); was not their fall a rebellion against God's authority?

*Fallen Angels: a Disquisition upon Human Existence; an Attempt to elucidate some of its Mysteries, especially those of Evil and of Suffering.* By ONE OF THEM. (London: Gay and Bird, 1894.)

IT is not easy to discover what the author of this book hopes to gain by his inquiry, unless, under the guise of the religion of Christ, he intends to forward the interests of Theosophy. He apparently believes that 'Jesus Christ,' the Son of God, 'is come in the flesh,'<sup>1</sup> but he does not hold orthodox views of the Incarnation, and does not look for the resurrection of the body. He has a strong objection to the doctrine of the Fall, as it is taught in Holy Scripture, and he rejects the Biblical theory of Original Sin. His leading principle is that man is 'born in sin,' because man has sinned in a previous existence, and that fallen mankind is to be identified with those 'angels which kept not their first estate,'<sup>2</sup> and that the spirits of men are passing through stages of restoration and recovery until the original condition of purity and bliss has been regained. He regards the human body as a temporary lodging for the spirit, and holds out no prospect of redemption for the whole man, but only for

<sup>1</sup> 1 St. John iv. 2, 3.

<sup>2</sup> St. Jude ver. 6.

his spirit, and believes in the restitution of the fallen angels and evil spirits, and, apparently, in the glorification of the spirits of beasts and the life of the vegetable creation. There is an extraordinary mixture of the Bible and Philosophy of all sorts ; there are quotations from Christian Fathers, Mystics, and Scientists, and all kinds of writers, ancient and modern—a great display of knowledge, but little real argument—and an abundance of poetry, good, bad, and indifferent. Chapter after chapter turns upon the same points—viz. the pre-existence of man, the transmigration of souls, and the explanation of the mystery of suffering as the punishment of sins committed in a previous state, and as the purification of the spirit for that time when it shall be emancipated from the body. The whole essay is a curious jumble : and yet we believe that the author would like to be regarded as a Christian, if not a Churchman ; but from what has been said it will be seen that the real name for such views is Gnosticism or Manichæism, and as such the book might prove dangerous if anyone seriously thought that it was worth reading. It is utterly wearisome, because assertion takes the place of argument, and quotations, anecdotes, and scientific scraps are made to do service for real thought and study. It is an attempt to make the doctrine of Evolution, or Darwinianism, fit in with certain extravagances of the author's imagination as to the teaching of Holy Scripture. There is no recognition of the Catholic Creed, nor of the authority of Christ's Church as a teaching body. A few passages from the book will show how unsatisfying this kind of speculation is. The title is taken from ch. ix., which is headed by a long quotation from Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Bk. iii., respecting the fall of Satan and his angels, and we read :

'The main suggestion of this work, then, is that human beings were angels, and dwelt originally in purity and light, as emanations from the Divine ; but that, having fallen, we are being graciously led back to Heaven by gradations of instruction' (p. 36).

In the chapter on Suffering we are told :

'We wandered from our home while yet in a spiritual condition ; when we shall have returned to that condition, the lessons we have had in the interval will be plainly understood. Freed from the flesh, we shall have a calm comprehension impossible to us now, and surely more rapid progress will then be made' (p. 31).

In reference to the Fall we read :—'The fall of man was but a repetition of the fall of the angels' (p. 51) ; but, naturally enough, the author cannot account for the temptation of mankind now by evil spirits, so he glozes the subject over (pp. 51, 53) because he sees that it is awkward for his theory. In speaking of Sin he says : 'Sin is a corruption of our original nature ; it is not essential to it, only possible in it. All the angels did not forsake their first estate' (p. 64) ; and (on p. 65) he goes on :

'There are doubtless not a few who would here remind me that in the Bible, the origin of all our sin and misery is attributed to the fall of Eve. But can men, capable of serious reflection, really reconcile themselves,

and t  
wom  
suffe  
be.

In th  
squa  
by s

'The  
hom  
maje  
the  
also  
Him  
effor  
for u  
Him

Suffi  
be in  
auth  
say  
led I  
that  
have  
theo  
conc  
from  
mus  
true  
glor  
the  
true

Con

THE  
rega  
Con  
unp  
allo  
give  
pam  
acac

'It  
Dis  
befo  
It is  
are  
in p  
thei  
duty

and that with complacency, to the idea that myriads and myriads of men, women, and children—yea, even infants—are all their lives exposed to suffering incalculable through the weakness of one woman? It cannot be.'

In the last chapter (xlii.), headed 'Cui bono?', the author tries to square his theory about 'fallen angels' with the sacrifice of Christ by saying (p. 226):

'The hypothesis that we are the fallen angels on our way back to our home, explains many mysteries and seeming incongruities; it lends a majesty to our race in its past, present, and future, and casts light on the divine dealings with us, and on the mission of Jesus Christ' (see also ch. x., 'God and His Sons'). 'Our old association with Christ Himself [*i.e.* as angels in Heaven] would render more clear His glorious efforts and sacrifices for our safety. It may well be said that He died for us, not because of any worth in us, but because of our great need of Him' (p. 227).

Sufficient has been said to show how dangerous such a book might be in the hands of one who was not established in the faith. The author himself, apparently, is little conscious of the absurdities, to say nothing of the irreverence and impiety, into which his theory has led him. We may well ask 'Cui bono?', because we are convinced that those who might be attracted by the title of the book will not have the patience to read through the forty-two chapters. The theory is not a new one, and the treatment of it is far from being conclusive. We cannot believe that any Christian will derive comfort from the notion that his spirit is that of a 'fallen angel,' and that he must pass through a series of existences before he can regain his true home. The hope of the resurrection of the body, and the glorification of the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, according to the Christian Faith, is much more comforting, as well as much more true to God's revelation.

*Considerations upon Disestablishment and Disendowment.* By R. C. MOBERLY, D.D., Canon of Christ Church. (Oxford: Jas. Parker and Co.)

THIS pamphlet is published to explain Dr. Moberly's position with regard to an amendment which he moved at the recent Diocesan Conference at Oxford. This amendment, the writer explains, was unpopular, and received very small support, and as the ten minutes allowed to its proposer was insufficient to set forth his reasons, he gives them at length in a pamphlet of seventy three pages. The pamphlet is a well-written scholarly production of a most decidedly academic type. At considerable length the writer asserts:

'It seems to me of primary importance to insist that when proposals for Disestablishment are made, there is no ecclesiastical proposal whatever before the Church—there is only a political proposal before the State. It is not Churchmen, as such, but citizens, and Churchmen so far as they are citizens, who have a proposal before them. No doubt Churchmen, in point of fact, are citizens also. Nevertheless, it is upon them, not in their character as Churchmen, but in their character as citizens, that the duty is laid of forming a political decision, and acting upon it' (p. 13).

With this we cannot quite agree. The legal position of a clergyman in a parish affects his responsibilities and his opportunities, and he is certainly an important Churchman. If on the one hand it demands from him some duties which he would rather avoid, on the other it opens every house to his visits in a way that he would not enjoy if his relations to his parishioners were purely conventional. So far as the essential independence of the organization of the Church is concerned, we agree with Dr. Moberly, but when the relations of the Church to the State have grown up during many centuries, and have become intertwined as they now are in England, we think they could not be rudely and completely plucked asunder without serious moral injury to both. Dr. Moberly admits this when he says :

‘And, certainly, though the fact may be less aggressively familiar, there are hundreds of thousands of Churchmen to whom Disestablishment would cause not heartburnings only, but such sense of outrage and insult as no wise politician can afford to despise’ (p. 28).

He further says :

‘But whilst for manifold reasons the case for Disestablishment is not clear, there can on the other hand be no question at all that there would be very much and very direct loss in the inevitable throwing away of the national homage towards God, the national corporate acknowledgment of the Church of Christ’ (p. 30).

It is impossible not to agree with him cordially when he says :

‘The responsibility of making it [Disestablishment] in a spirit of national levity, with all its reckless throwing away of history, and cutting to pieces of association—the best probably and most deeply rooted in many instances of all the associations which go to the growth of our national English character, is a responsibility which must—which ought to—make the lightest hearted grave. For if we did this thing without need, on false motives, wrongfully, the penalty which we should nationally pay for hastiness would assuredly be neither light nor transient.

And yet, though to many of us what he so strongly condemns seems to be the very thing that one party in the State is doing at the present time, he deprecates most strongly the Church appearing to be identified with a political party. How are Churchmen to defend what is esteemed by them as precious except by espousing the party that desires to preserve what they value, and by opposing the party that places in the forefront of the measures it desires the overthrow of what they prize? We may all sincerely regret that the relations of the Church with the State have been made a political question; but when they have been so made it is impossible for sound-hearted Churchmen to be neutral, and to hold themselves free to support this party or that without reference to a question which touches them so nearly.

Dr. Moberly insists very strongly upon separating Disestablishment from Disendowment. We quite agree with him that *theoretically* they differ essentially, but *practically* at the present time it is impossible to separate the consideration of them. For those who seek either, desire both : without Disendowment they do not care for



Disestablishment. So long, therefore, as the attack unites the two, the defence must do the same. When in practical politics there is any sign of our opponents aiming at the one and not at the other, we may then be content to consider them apart. Until that time arrives, it only weakens our power of resistance to tell our opponents that it is possible to get one thing at a time, and that they may find the resistance weaker if they adopt this mode of attack. We do not mean to say that Dr. Moberly suggests such a mode of proceeding, or that he would advocate the separate consideration of the two subjects with any such intention. But questions are linked together, and however we may desire to keep them separate it is beyond our power to do so. And however earnestly and truthfully Dr. Moberly might disown the sinister purpose we have named, we fear that such a conclusion seems to us to flow naturally from what he says.

With some things that he says about Disendowment we can agree, from others we most heartily dissent. If Disestablishment and Disendowment are such essentially different things as he asserts in the earlier portion of his essay, it seems difficult to understand the following :

‘For the present moment, however, I merely make use of this thought as a sort of climax to the considerations going before ; and upon them all I must certainly say for myself that in the event of the great political change known as Disestablishment, I concede, *ex animo*, that the State would have, not only the power but the right, not only the right but the duty, to go most fully into all the details involved in determining the question of Disendowment. So far from being able to agree in any claim that all question of property should be left alone, as if either sacrilege or robbery or injustice would be necessarily involved in touching it, I should rather hold that it would be a palpable dereliction of duty on the part of the community to let that mighty revolution take effect without trying to get, even painfully, to the bottom of the question of the continuance of the endowments as a complex question of the highest political responsibility’ (pp. 49-50).

No doubt such would have been the feeling of Henry VIII. and his advisers when they despoiled the Church of half of her possessions. They represented the powerful partner in the readjustment of the Church's possessions, and we have an object-lesson in what they did which we should be foolish to forget. Considering who would be the judges to decide the question under the circumstances supposed, it is not difficult to see what would be the result of such an examination as is here suggested, and that the issue of a re-examination of the Church's right to the property which her faithful children have bequeathed for the spread of her religion and influence would not be practically different now from what it was then. Individual greed would not be rampant as it then was, but parochial greed would take its place. Instead of a few men being enriched by the plunder, the mass of people would expect a small profit in lightened rates. As a matter of principle we do not see a pin to choose between the two modes of action. It needs no prophet to foretell that Disestablishment and Disendowment mean the same thing. In an academical discussion like that put before us by Dr. Moberly they may be held

to differ ; to the world at large they present a very different appearance.

Whilst therefore we recognize the ability with which some of the arguments are stated, and the evident desire not to bring prominently to the front his own political preferences, we cannot be surprised at the reception which his resolution met with at the Oxford Diocesan Conference, and in our judgment whatever advantage may be derived from his pamphlet will be reaped by those who oppose his conclusions, and not by those who agree with them.

*Oxford and her Colleges : a View from the Radcliffe Library.* By GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

THERE is a well-authenticated story current in Oxford to the effect that an American, desirous of studying at Oxford, wrote to ask if he could be 'roomed in the village.' Whether the story is true or not, it is at any rate *ben trovato*. It is for Americans in the first instance that Dr. Goldwin Smith has compiled this small outline of the history of the University and her Colleges, in the hope, which is by no means a vain or imaginary one, that an increasing number of Americans may turn their eyes to Oxford and Cambridge not less than to the Universities of Germany. At Oxford, at any rate, this hope is being increasingly realized, and the recent important proposal modifying the conditions of obtaining a degree in Oxford was urged partly on this ground. An American, not long ago, expressed his opinion of Oxford as the scene of the ideal life of study, and the only fear is lest the charms of its outward attractions should prove too powerful for the claims of student-life.

Let none expect in this little book a guide-book of the ordinary kind. It is rather a summary of the history of the University of Oxford from its beginning to the present day, and the idea of making the top of the Radcliffe Library [but why Radclyffe on the frontispiece?] the standpoint is, though not wholly new, as many visitors can testify, yet certainly excellent. 'Here are six centuries ; if you choose to include the Norman Castle, here are eight centuries ; and if you choose to include certain Saxon remnants in Christ Church Cathedral, here are ten centuries chronicled in stone' (p. 3). So that the 'village' bears traces, at any rate, of a respectable antiquity. Through these centuries Dr. Goldwin Smith traces the fortunes of Oxford and its importance at successive epochs in the history of English life. And we can commend this little book as one from which, not only American students but many English who hope to go there, or have been there, may learn to realize something of the *genius loci*. Few, indeed, we imagine, of all who have passed through a course of study there, could tell anything very definite of its past history. Let them get this little book, which is inexpensive, and very readable, and fills a place which is hardly yet filled by any other small book, unless it be indeed the Warden of Merton's *History of the University of Oxford*. The only other attempt we know of in recent times was Mr. Gladstone's Romanes Lecture, which, with rather a different title, touched on many of the points herein mentioned. Of

course there are very many things which we should regard from quite a different point of view from that which Dr. Goldwin Smith adopts. We understand, but of course we cannot endorse, 'the emancipation and reform' by which he speaks of the Oxford of to-day as reunited to the nation. There is also a trace throughout of antipathy to 'clericism' (as it is once called); e.g. in his account of Christ Church Hall he describes it 'as the finest room, barring Westminster Hall, in England, and filled with those portraits of *alumni* which, notwithstanding the frequency of pudding sleeves, form the fairest tapestry with which hall was ever hung' (p. 47). His language, too, on tests (p. 51) is another point to which we should take exception. But for anyone who knows Dr. Goldwin Smith's position, and can duly discount it, the book will be found attractive from its charm of style and historical sense. Of course, there are many things which would raise a smile on the face of a resident, there are others which betoken just that being out of touch with the present life of the place which is inevitable in the case of one who is not a resident in the place, though we are glad to welcome Dr. Goldwin Smith as a more or less regular visitant. There are some little inaccuracies too, which come from the same impossibility to keep pace with the constant changes, which are deemed necessary by some and accepted by others, in the stream of Oxford life. Thus, while the boat-races may be quoted as an apt illustration of college enthusiasm, and the strength of college feeling, it is not so apt to say 'go to yonder cricket ground when a college match is being played' (p. 7); for the enthusiasm over college cricket is somewhat damped by the distance of the 'yonder,' and a college football match would have been a better illustration. Again, can the profits of the Clarendon Press be rightly described as 'infinitesimal' (p. 11)? It is true that its profits are ungrudgingly given to the bringing out of some books little likely to be remunerative, but its profits must be large to allow it to do this, and yet make a handsome contribution to the finances of the University. But very select is the circle to whom the secrets of the Press are known—even the proctors, who sit on every other board, being excluded. Again, the University Council Chamber (if by that Dr. Goldwin Smith means the weekly meeting-place of the Hebdomadal Council) is no longer in the Clarendon Building (p. 11), but in the new schools. Again, Guy Fawkes's lantern is no longer in the Gallery of the Bodleian (p. 12), but in the Ashmolean Museum, and all the treasures of this latter place (p. 14), by the time these lines appear in print, will, we believe, have found for themselves a new home, more spacious, but of hideous exterior, at the back of the Taylor Buildings; while the future fate of the Ashmolean Museum may be to be swallowed up in the rapacious maw of the Bodleian Library. Again, some statements are open to question: thus is it the case (p. 26) that University and Balliol take precedence of Merton in the *University Calendar* on the same ground, viz. 'the priority of benefactions, out of which those colleges grew'? Again, on p. 4, the date for the admission of non-collegiate students is wrongly given as 1856, though something of the kind was then spoken

of. On the next page 'the Ancient House of Congregation'—it is true an unintended survival, as we have been told—might have been mentioned as part of the University Legislature, inasmuch as it has still certain duties to perform. May we ask Dr. Goldwin Smith when another edition is wanted whether he will preserve Chicheley (pp. 40-41), and whether he will not substitute *or* for *nor* in a sentence to which we have already referred on p. 25. Is there not something contradictory in what is said (pp. 42, 46) in reference to University Readers, and the idea from which they grew? But these are the chief things we have noticed, and would like to see altered, apart from that general difference in standpoint to which we have already referred. There are many interesting and shrewd sayings, of which we must quote some. Thus (p. 17) the following remarks on scholasticism :

'The school philosophy, logical and philosophical, with its strange metaphysical jargon ; an immense attempt to extract knowledge from consciousness by syllogistic reasoning, instead of gathering it from observation, experience, and research, mocking, by its barrenness of fruit, the faith of the enthusiastic student, yet training the mind to preternatural acuteness, and perhaps forming a necessary stage in the mental education of the race.'

Or again (p. 37) :

'Self-love in a mediæval ascetic was not annihilated by humility, though it took a religious form.'

Or again (p. 40) :

'The history of these foundations is full of lessons for benefactors who fancy that they can impress their will upon posterity.'

By the way, this last point is one that we think so-called reformers might bear in mind perhaps more than they do, while all the time, in their need of funds for their own pet schemes for the regeneration of mankind, they are calling out 'Give, give.' The same strain appears again on p. 60 :

'Let founders and all who have a fashion for regulating the lives of other people, for propagating their wills beyond the reach of their foresight, and for grasping posterity, as it were, with a dead hand, take warning by a disastrous example.'

Striking, too, is the simile applied to the beginnings of Oxford life in the twelfth century :

'Universities have been coming out all over Europe like stars in the night ; Paris, famous for theology and philosophy, perhaps being the brightest of the constellation, while Bologna was famed for law and Salerno for medicine' (p. 15).

We must send our readers to the book itself if they would know—and how many know?—in what the Proctors originated, or how the title of Scholars once included the Fellows, marking that study, not tuition, was the *raison d'être* of College as distinguished from 'University Life.' This title remains still in the formula used in documents, 'The Principal and Scholars,' &c. We cannot here follow the steps by which the successive changes in the idea of Uni-

vers  
on i  
who  
(p. 3  
tion  
of t  
were  
first  
long  
can  
of th  
stim  
fello  
plic  
We  
of th  
view  
of h  
Oxf  
so on  
as sh  
her v  
The  
'  
is in  
(p. 90  
And  
'T  
away  
who l  
W  
rema  
book  
hopes  
tive w  
'T  
cessio  
passed  
tions  
flowed  
sity ex  
of itse  
matri  
vice-cl  
puttin  
world  
with t  
hall, fr  
comm  
tions o

versity life were made, how the College came to have undergraduates on its foundation, and to provide for the training of youth during the whole interval between school and the highest University degree (p. 33), and how the Universities, becoming places of general education, ceased to be the heritage of the poor, and became the heritage of the rich, or how the mediæval statutes came to be evaded, or were successively modified by later statutes, and in these latter days, first by one commission and then by another, and we doubt not ere long the present state of things will be modified by yet a third. We cannot trace the great changes by which, after the intellectual dulness of the perhaps over-abused eighteenth century (pp. 73, 77, 79), fresh stimulus was given by the new system of examination, and how fellowships were thrown open, and so yet further stimulus was applied. There are many things on which we should like to have dwelt. We will conclude by reference to Professor Goldwin Smith's summary of the present state of things, of which he takes a more favourable view than we had expected, or perhaps should endorse. With two of his warnings and a long quotation we will close, and send all Oxford men, all who hope to send sons to Oxford, to this book, that so one and all may come imbued with such a sense of the *genius loci* as shall teach them really to know Oxford, and knowing her, to love her with that love which has been described as itself an education. The warnings are these, and we endorse them :

'Oxford is now, indeed, rather too attractive ; her academical society is in danger of being swamped by the influx of non-academical residents' (p. 90).

And again :

'The moral is that many youths come to Oxford who had better stay away, since none get any good and few fail to get some harm, saving those who have an aptitude for study' (p. 92).

Would that all parents would take to heart and act on the last remark ! Our long quotation we make almost from the end of the book ; a quotation calculated to revive memories and to inspire hopes, and also to illustrate the stimulating, sympathetic, and attractive way in which this little book is written :

'The Buildings stand to mark, by their varying architecture, the succession of the changeful centuries through which the University has passed. In the libraries are the monuments of the successive generations of learnings. But the tide of youthful life that from age to age has flowed through college, quadrangle, hall, and chamber, through University examination rooms and Convocation houses, has left no memorials of itself except the entries in the University and College books ; dates of matriculation which tell of the bashful boy standing before the august vice-chancellor at entrance ; dates of degrees which tell of the youth putting forth from his last haven of tutelage on the waves of the wide world. Hither they thronged century after century in the costume and with the equipments of their times, from mediæval abbey, grange, and hall, from Tudor manor-house and homestead, from mansion, rectory, and commercial city of a later day, bearing with them the hopes and affections of numberless homes. Year after year they departed, lingering for

N N 2

a moment at the gate to say farewell to college friends, the bond with whom they vowed to preserve, but whom they were never to see again, then stepped forth into the chances and perils of life, while the shadow on the College dial moved on its unceasing round . . . Youthful effort, ambition, aspiration, hope, College character, and friendship have no artist to paint them—at least as yet they have had none. But whatever of poetry belongs to them is present in full measure here' (pp. 90-3).

*Anecdota Oxoniensia: Medieval and Modern Series.* Part X. The Earliest Translation of the Old Testament into the Basque Language (a Fragment). Edited by LLEWELLYN THOMAS, M.A. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1894.)

THE manuscript from which this translation is taken is one of those in the library of the Earl of Macclesfield at Shirburn Castle in Oxfordshire. It is unknown how this and other Basque manuscripts of considerable interest and value found their way into this library. Mr. Thomas in his very careful Introduction thinks it may have been due to an interest in the language founded upon a supposed connexion between Welsh and Basque, not perhaps so false a theory as one recently broached which would connect Basque and Russian. There seems, however, to be evidence directly connecting the family of the translator with a former Earl of Macclesfield. The manuscript consists of 138 leaves, and it is the opinion of those who have seen this and other manuscripts there that the translation is written by the same hand as a Basque Grammar which contains a note saying it was made by Pierre d'Urte of St. Jean de Luz, and the date is about the year 1700. It is therefore the earliest known translation into Basque of the Old Testament. Of the translator little is known, but he is supposed to have been 'one of the ministers of the reformed Church, who after the Revocation (1685) of the Edict of Nantes sought refuge in England from the religious persecution which assailed them at home' (p. xiii). Of the Old Testament we have only a fragment, viz. Genesis and Exodus as far as xxii. 6, where the translation abruptly ends. Mr. Thomas discusses a number of points of general interest in connexion with this interesting relic, such as (1) the merits of the translation, (2) where and when it was made, (3) how far it is intelligible at the present day. After this Mr. Thomas gives some interesting information as to the history of Bible translation for and among the Basques; and in an Appendix by Mr. E. S. Dodgson we find a list compiled from Vinson's *Essai d'une Bibliographie de la Langue Basque* of the various known editions of the whole or parts of the Bible in any of the Basque dialects. As to the merits of the translation, Mr. Thomas has modestly taken the opinion of native Basques, or those who have made a thorough study of the language. The opinion expressed is warmly in support of the excellence of the translation as a vigorous piece of composition in Basque. At the same time the translator seems not always to have had a sufficiently copious vocabulary, and in such cases he leaves out the difficulties. Again, his knowledge of French, the language from which the version was made, seems to have been not very good; and thus in Gen. xii. 10 we get for the



words 'there was a famine in the land' the words 'now there came a woman to the land,' which, Mr. Thomas suggests, is the result of a confusion between *famine* and *famme* or *femme*. So in xxvi. 14, 'the riches of the patriarch Isaac are exemplified by the number of his slaves. In the French version the word *serfs* is used, which the translator seems to have taken for *cerfs*, and renders by Orkhaitç "deer." As to the question, Where and when it was made? the date is settled at about the year 1700, but the place cannot be fixed. An attempt was made to use the evidence of the watermark on the paper, but unfortunately this does not help, for it proves the paper to have been of Dutch or Flemish manufacture, and this paper seems to have been commonly used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in France and England, so that it does not afford conclusive evidence as between these two places. As to the degree in which the translation can be understood at the present time, there would seem no doubt that it is quite intelligible. This has been proved by a reference of the proofs to native Basques. In regard to the vocabulary, Mr. Thomas says, only one word used in the translation is now obsolete, though some others may have changed their meaning. One striking feature seems to be the freedom with which foreign words are incorporated. This Mr. Thomas regards as evidence that the language was then vigorous, and not timid lest, by the introduction of foreign elements, it should harm its own vitality. This incorporation of foreign words seems, according to M. Vinson, to have been always characteristic of St. Jean de Luz in contrast with more inland places. Finally, Mr. Thomas gives some account of the attempts to disseminate the Basque version of the Bible among the natives of those provinces. To the failure of these attempts Mr. Thomas traces the perpetuation of a number of contending dialects, instead of one predominating literary dialect having been created. As a contrast Mr. Thomas refers to the unifying effect on the Welsh language of Bishop Morgan's Bible. And, indeed, he might have illustrated from other languages, such as our own and Danish, and many others, the wonderful influence which early Bible translations have had in fixing the literary dialect of the country.

It may interest some of our readers to summarize the history of the Basque translation. The earliest version is that made by Liçarrague in 1571. This was based on a French translation earlier than that of Geneva, and possibly this may have been the translation of Olivetan. This version has now become very rare, and probably the number of perfect or imperfect copies in existence does not exceed thirty. This translation does not seem to have contained more than the New Testament. The fragment edited by Mr. Thomas comes next in order of time, so that it is the oldest translation in Basque of the Old Testament. This was made from the famous Geneva version of 1588. 'Wherever the French version varies from the Vulgate or other versions the Basque follows the variation. Every mistake, mistranslation, misprint, misspelling is reproduced.' At the beginning of this century the British and Foreign Bible Society caused the version of Liçarrague to be revised, that the archaisms might be

removed, but unfortunately the work was entrusted to one acquainted only with another dialect of Basque. Some thirty years later (in 1859), under the auspices of Prince L. L. Bonaparte, that unwearied investigator of dialects, was achieved the work of publishing a translation, based on a French version of the Vulgate, of the whole Bible in the Labourdin dialect. This is the basis of the edition published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Mr. Thomas expresses his anxiety that the Basque people may soon have in their hands a translation of the Bible, for that made in 1859 with the help of Captain Duvoisin, and known by his name, has also become very scarce. The Old Testament has been especially neglected. Mr. Thomas apologizes for having reproduced all the variations of forms, &c., found in this manuscript; but we are glad that Mr. Thomas has been scholarly enough to refuse to tamper with the *ipsissima verba* of the manuscript, which he has given, with the assistance of the Rev. A. Clark, in the exact form in which they are there found. There can be no doubt that, had he thus mutilated the text of the manuscript, it would have lost a large part of its value for those who find in these Biblical translations their earliest information as to the language of the country, and the reputation of the Clarendon Press would have been to that extent damaged. Mr. Thomas expresses his obligations to the Rev. A. Clark, who has revised the proofs with the manuscript; and he has also had the assistance of two such well-known Basque authorities as M. Vinson and the Rev. Wentworth Webster.

*The Garden that I Love.* By ALFRED AUSTIN. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

It may be that after once reading this book one may leave it with a feeling of impatience, not lessened by the somewhat unintelligible conclusion. This may be, perhaps, because—to borrow a reference from Mr. Austin's *Garden*—one has not discerned the form which underlies the apparent formlessness. The feeling may be due also to the fact that one finds in it less about the 'Garden that I Love' and more about the persons who frequent it. But if the rapidity with which saying follows saying leaves at first a sense of unrest, it disappears again on second reading. Truth to say, the book touches many things, and we have Mr. Austin before us not merely as poet, but also as gardener in the garden that he loves. The book is, indeed, a sort of idyll, wherein the writer descants on one theme after another, in the name now of Veronica, now of Lamia, now of the poet, now of himself. The writer describes how he sought, found, and got possession of the house which corresponded to his ideal—a house with 'retirement, seclusion, and old-world charm'—and how round and about this house he made for himself an ideal garden. The story is lightened by the human elements introduced in Veronica, sister of the writer, sceptical and pessimistic; Veronica the Martha-like, who takes a matter-of-fact view of everything, a 'gardener only by accident,' loving the garden best where it is tidy and productive, and falling in love with the poet who stays with

them; a poet who does not do anything irregular or pseudo-original, who 'has nothing peculiar either in his antecedents or in his career.' 'In all the external conditions of his life he is a very ordinary person. His hair is no longer than that of his neighbours, he is scrupulously well-dressed, he lives with his mother, whom he adores, earns his bread by inspecting elementary schools, and pays his debts with prosaic punctuality' (p. 44). The last member of the quartette is Lamia, who comes to them with the poet. She is a strong contrast to Veronica. 'She will sing Tuscan *Stornelli* by the score, or will play havoc with Veronica's guitar as she invents some madcap accompaniment to the latest production of Shaftesbury Avenue. Nor is it within the bounds of prediction to say whether she will lead one into labyrinthine dialogues concerning the riddle of the universe, or turn all one's most settled convictions topsy-turvy with perfectly sincere paradoxes' (p. 41). In the *entr'actes*, if one may so call them, Mr. Austin discourses pleasantly, and with an enthusiasm not always suppressed, of the garden that he loves. This garden must 'abound in flowers, and not in one nook or corner, but everywhere, from at least the day of All Fools to the day of All Saints' (p. 10). The gardening is 'a partnership in which Nature, the senior partner, exercises the principal authority. It is only fair that she should, for hers is the main portion of the capital, and she admits you into the business only because, while a clerk in her service, you displayed a certain amount of skill and a good deal of assiduity' (p. 11). How to humour Nature is what the gardener has to learn, and he is the best gardener who makes fewest mistakes in his lesson. We shall hardly need to add that in this ideal garden all is not trim and regular. Place is found for nature's untidiness. This very untidiness is her contribution to the beauty of what man has done. Of course, too, we have allusion to the conflict between the formal and the landscape styles of gardening. Acting on the statement that life is a lesson in compromise, which we find elsewhere in the book, the writer would find place in his ideal garden for calceolarias, geraniums, ageratum—'everything that you have a right to look for in a highly respectable enclosure.' We may add, however, that this style finds a place only as a relief from, and a foil to, the less formal and more haphazard style. Incidentally, too, we learn how to preserve tulips from year to year, so as to make the bill for bulbs less formidable. 'One's tulips are a possession for ever if one only goes the right way about preserving them. It is simplicity itself.' What that way is we will let the reader discover from the book itself. We will only recommend that the reader follow Mr. Austin's suggestion and cover his tulip-bed with forget-me-nots. Nor, again, will we reveal the charm by which Mr. Austin secures his apple-trees from the ravages of caterpillar and moth. Nor will we give the rustic's *recipe* for taking a wasps' nest. We must, however, quote the words in which he expresses his preference for his own method over those suggested to him. 'You see, Miss, they don't know nothing about it, and that's why they writes in the papers. Them that knows doesn't write; they acts, Miss, as I'm agoing to now' (p. 154).

We will not dilate on the advocacy of the claims of the tea-rose as against the hybrid perpetual, nor on the superiority of the wild rose to both, or on the charms of wilder nature in the early spring, or of an English orchard, or on what it is which makes art necessary where nature does so much.

Apart from all that we find on these and kindred topics, there is much to say, sometimes in a paradoxical way, of higher subjects, and the varied characters of the actors in the scene make what is said more crisp and effective. Mr. Austin recurs time after time to reflections on women, sometimes serious, sometimes light, but always true to nature. Veronica and her urn, Veronica and her garden-party, are alike real. Sometimes we get a philosophy of life condensed into such sentences as this: 'It is one's failures in life that make one gentle and forgiving with oneself, and I almost think it is the failures of others that mostly endear them to us' (p. 13). Or again we get, *à propos* of the formal and the less formal in gardening, a piece of literary criticism in a comparison of Pope and Wordsworth; but, perhaps, of all this what is said of present-day poetry is best worth attention, for Mr. Austin, even in the book before us, is first of all a poet. It is the old question of the form and the matter of poetry, and what subjects are fit for poetic treatment. The text for the discussion is an author unnamed, but hardly disguised.

'Is it not rather, he [the poet] asked, that people, even in respect of poetry, rave about what expresses their own sentiments, their own opinions, their own bias? The controversial attitude of mind necessarily leads to utterance, often to violent utterance. The appreciation of beauty induces silence. In this volume [the poet refers to a volume of poems he is reading] many questions of immediate interest are dealt with, I might almost say argumentatively; and people who agree with the writer incautiously accept what he says as poetry because it is presented to them in the guise of verse. But poetry is a luminous halo which makes thought clearer as well as larger. Here I find nothing but unmusical mist' (p. 87). And again (p. 157), Lamia is made to say, 'I wish there were more elementary verses. Too many persons to-day write as though they had a prize poem in their head.' Mr. Austin is thinker as well as gardener, and he is also poet. As poet he has given us in this book one or two very pretty pieces which conform to the canons he has laid down. Such are those beginning, 'If love could last, if love could last,' and 'Had I a garden it should lie.' We will quote, in conclusion, two stanzas from yet a third poem, 'grave and sad' (p. 157):

O Death! beautiful Death,  
Why do they thee disfigure?  
To me thy touch, thy breath,  
Hath nor alarm nor rigour.  
Thee do I long await;  
I think thee very late;  
I pine much to be going:  
Others have gone before;  
I hunger more and more  
To know what they are knowing.

Weak heart be thou content !  
 Accept thy banishment ;  
 Like other sorrows, life will end for thee :  
 Yet for a little while  
 Bear with this harsh exile,  
 And Death will soften, and will send for thee.

*Religion in History and in Modern Life.* Together with an Essay on the Church and the Working Classes. By A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894.)

IN this volume Dr. Fairbairn has republished a series of lectures delivered, he tells us, 'almost ten years' ago (p. 3) to working men in Bradford. Since their former publication they have been 'revised throughout, and in certain places expanded,' although 'expansion has not been found possible where it was most needed—in the concluding lecture,' that on 'the Christian Religion in Modern Life' (Preface, p. v).

Naturally these lectures, like other of Dr. Fairbairn's writings, contain passages and lines of thought with which we are compelled to disagree. There is a marked absence of any adequate sense of an objective Revelation in the Christian Faith committed to the Church, and of the reality of objective grace bestowed by God in defined and restricted ways. There are serious misconceptions of the place of the Priesthood in Christian history. There are other matters to comment upon which would be to enter into controversy.

We prefer to call attention to parts of the lectures which appear to us valuable. That the teaching on the nature of religion needs to be greatly supplemented does not prevent it from containing much that is of force and utility. There are admirable passages on the subjective side of religion, and in the section of the first lecture in which there are, in our opinion, serious omissions we have noticed a practical explanation of the inferences from the idea of God given by our Lord, likely to be eminently useful to those for whom the lectures were originally intended.

'I will ask you to think of God as the Saviour has taught us to think of Him, and then see how this bears on action. He is not only almighty, but He is good, holy, wise, loving, tender, compassionate, just. Take, for example : God is a Being infinitely good ; then He cannot but hate sin, He cannot but hate all conscious and voluntary guilt ; but if God hates sin, the religious man, governed by his idea of God, hates it too, and lives that he may end its reign on earth. God is righteous. Then, if He is righteous, He cannot but hate wrong ; all forms of wrong, personal, social, industrial, political, are hateful to Him ; and the man who is a religious man, governed by his thought of God, must live to conquer wrong. God is tender, compassionate ; then all sorrow, all pain, and all anguish are to Him painful, the cause of deepest pity and regret ; and the religious man lives to overcome all pain, to subdue it, to minister to it ; to take the outcast, and the lonely, and the feeble, and the desolate into the protection of His great pity. God is love ; then He loves to see man saved, to see him happy, to see happiness multiplied below ; and so the religious man is the man who saves men, who creates happiness, who

makes all earth a scene of wider joy and of grander moral worth. Theology is the interpretation of the universe through the idea of God. Religion is the regulation of life through the same great idea; it is the application to all things, and all events, of the great spiritual, moral, ethical, rational elements contained in that idea' (pp. 91, 92).

Of the value of the Old Testament there is more than one impressive declaration, and from these we may select the passage in which it is said that 'this book'

'contains, from the literary and moral points of view, the most remarkable code of ancient times. It contains the quaintest, most beautiful, and graphic history. It contains the supreme devotional literature of the world, the literature that men in their highest moments of religious transport or of pious meditation have used to express thoughts too deep for words. It contains poetry that, simply as poetry, stands foremost in its own order, full of a great sense of mystery, full of an awful sense of suffering, pierced and transformed by a glorious sense of God. It possesses more than all a conception of God and an idea of man, without a parallel in the literature and religions of the ancient world. That Book is the noblest heirloom of humanity. To every man it belongs as an inalienable birthright. To its best truths, to its inmost heart, to its meaning, for this and for all times, you have an indefeasible right. The worst of frauds were the act of the man who should cheat you out of it' (p. 103).

There is a useful contrast of some characteristic features in the system of Buddha and that of Christ.

'Buddha so hated life as to extinguish the very desire to mend it; Christ so loved life as to create in all who loved Him the desire for its ennoblement. The men who have most imitated Buddha have preached a gospel of annihilation; the men who have best known Christ have preached a gospel of salvation, of grace that reigns through righteousness unto eternal life. The aim of Buddha was to make men know their misery, that they might be willing to lay down the burden of existence, but the purpose of Christ was to make men conscious of sin that they might live unto holiness, forsake the darkness and seek the light. To Buddha the highest life was the secluded, the renunciation of the familiar duties of society and the home; but to Christ the holiest life was the life of active beneficence, the piety that helped our neighbour, that honoured God by serving man' (pp. 171-2).

In a rapid sketch at the end of the fourth lecture Dr. Fairbairn points out some of the practical effects of the working of Christianity in the world. It affected the position of slaves, it put down the amphitheatre, it brought into existence a 'large belief in the dignity of labour,' it 'consecrated the home,' it 'organized' 'charities,' it substituted 'a new mental, a new moral, a new spiritual basis for life' (pp. 201-5). And in the last lecture he shows how the influence of Christianity should be exercised in the giving of 'charity,' in 'the housing of the poor,' in 'what is perhaps the saddest of all our modern problems, what men call the social evil,' and in 'questions in industry' (pp. 262-9).

'My hope,' he says, 'for the future is in the ideal of Christ. My hope for man is in a more perfect and complete embodiment of the Christian



religion. When I look abroad and see the disintegrative agencies that are hard at work, the one thing I am anxious to do is to bring the great constructive, the great architectonic principles of our Christian faith into relation with life and action. Every Christian principle embodied in law or society, every Christian deed accomplished in industry, helps on the happier time' (p. 270).

But perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the new Introduction on 'The Church and the Working Classes.' Like the lectures, this essay contains passages with which we cannot agree, among which we may mention the mischievous statements about the Church on p. 31. But in very many ways we think it admirable. There is an acute realization of the condition of affairs at the present time. This is shown in what is said about the changed relations between masters and workmen (pp. 32-4), the effect which modern methods of work have had on religious habits (pp. 38-9), the evil results of some amusements and the things connected with them (pp. 41-2), the bad influence exercised by too many newspapers (p. 43), the failure to improve religious education (pp. 47-8) side by side with the most wonderful growth in secular education (pp. 45-6), and the emphatic statement that

'men are coming to see more clearly that, for moral rather than economical reasons, questions between classes are never merely class questions, and that what depresses the standard of living in any one class lowers the level and worth of life throughout the community as a whole' (p. 8).

There is a no less clear perception of lessons to be learnt from history, with a striking passage about disasters in the French Church.

'The supreme calamity of French Catholicism, or rather the crime which no later sufferings can ever atone for, was its alliance with the king and the Court. The king had been a convenient instrument in the religious wars; by his help Protestantism was practically annihilated, and it was thought that since he was so good for one thing he could be made equally good for all. As his will was sovereign, to control him was to control France. And so the great concern of Catholicism was to keep possession of the king, which it did without being too curious as to the kind and quality of the king possessed. But in being so careful of him it lost the people, and put into the hands of his enemies, who were therefore also the enemies of his Church, the most tremendous weapon that was ever levelled against religion. For in their fury the assailants did not distinguish religion from the men who betrayed it, and Christianity was made to bear and to suffer for the sins of Catholicism' (pp. 26-7).

A pleasing feature is in the recognition of the value of the home.

'The most needful thing of all is the recreation of the home, for in industrial England it has almost ceased to be. Increased domesticity means the increase of all the finer affections, the rise of all the more

<sup>1</sup> It would be more correct to say 'of some Catholics,' but this does not affect the general sense of the passage.

gracious cares and hopes and loves. . . . It seems, therefore, as if the recovery of the home were the final necessity of the situation' (p. 42).

'If we could only create the happier and more wholesome home, the battle were as good as won' (p. 58).

Our quotations will have shown that, if there are parts of *Religion in History and in Modern Life* which we cannot commend, Churchmen who will think over and weigh its teaching may learn much from it, and that Dr. Fairbairn has not a few qualifications for writing on whatever estrangement of the working classes from religion may exist, and for addressing working men themselves. We could wish he had the further, in our judgment, inestimable advantage of being able to consider the problems with which the book is concerned from the point of view of Catholic Christianity.

*The Resurrection of the Dead.* An Exposition of 1 Corinthians xv. By the late WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1894.)

THIS book consists of a series of studies which appeared originally in *The Monthly Interpreter* and *The Expositor*. We are told in a prefatory note that 'they are now republished in accordance with what is known to have been the writer's intention.'

The fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians has very special difficulties, even among the writings of St. Paul, and it affords abundant scope for Dr. Milligan's skill as an expositor. Students of the Epistle will find this work serviceable.

It is a great deal more than a mere commentary. It shows a wise perception of the state of mind with which many readers will use it. It is full of most varied and suggestive thoughts. But, while this is so, Dr. Milligan does not forget that the work he has in hand is the explanation of the meaning of the teaching of St. Paul, and he keeps closely to the text upon which he comments.

Among instances of careful exegesis we have noticed the chapter on the well-known and difficult passage in which St. Paul speaks of those who are 'baptized for the dead.' Dr. Milligan's suggested solution is interesting, though we are not prepared to say that it will commend itself to a large number of readers. He thinks that 'the dead' must mean those who have been 'already baptized, the Christian dead.' He sees in the mention of Baptism a reference to more than 'the mere initiatory Sacrament of the Christian life. It includes the thought of all to which the Christian pledged himself, the thought of the trials and sufferings which were then inseparable from the Christian profession, the thought of the self-denial and the self-sacrifice for the good of others to which, in accepting that Sacrament, the Christian became bound.' The passage, then, in his opinion, is parallel to the striking words in the Epistle to the Colossians,<sup>1</sup> where St. Paul speaks of the benefits which his sufferings bring to the Church. Those who are baptized are helping the dead.

<sup>1</sup> Col. i. 24.

'The Christian dead are not yet perfected. They have not yet attained to the full rest and refreshing which has been prepared for them; nor can they attain to it until the "reign" of Christ, carried on by means of His struggling and warring Church on earth, is finished. Everyone, therefore, who enters by Baptism into that Church, who takes upon him the name of Christ, and who pledges himself to a share in the contest of Christianity with the world, does so not to his own benefit only, but to the benefit of the Christian dead. He helps to bring that contest to its termination, which must be finished before the members of the Body of Christ can be clothed with perfect glory. In a strict sense of the words he is baptized, he is in jeopardy every hour, he dies daily, for their behoof not less than for his own. But he could not do so were there no resurrection for believers, because the thought of such resurrection at the end of the contest, and introducing the joy of the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwells only righteousness, is a fundamental ingredient in his state of mind. The expectation is essentially and absolutely necessary to the sacrifice. The latter rests upon and is sustained by the former. Upon the former as upon a chief foundation the building stands; and while it stands we know that the foundation is secure. . . . The very same thought continues to occupy the mind of the Apostle in the 30th and 31st verses. . . . It is the thought of these afflictions as endured *for the good of others*, and not in their bearing only upon himself and his fellow-labourers, that is still in the Apostle's mind. It is the "glorying" of the Church of Christ, or of that portion of it which he has served, that shines before him as his reward. It is *their* resurrection, not *his own*, though he too must rise to share it, that appears to him as his reward. *Their* loss of the eternal crown rather than *his* loss of it will deprive him of his "profit." In other words, the thought of "the dead," of the Christian dead, is still before him. He is fighting the Church's battle. He is winning the Church's victory. But all this implied the resurrection of the dead. Why should he and others endure all these struggles were there no resurrection and no hereafter? If their hope of sharing the glory prepared for the risen Lord after His struggle was a delusion, their life and labours were a mistake' (pp. 89-95).

We regret that Dr. Milligan should have expressed the opinion that St. Paul probably thought the second coming of our Lord near at hand (pp. 219, 220). Quite apart from any question of Inspiration, it has always seemed to us that the most likely interpretation of the various passages in the Epistles which bear on the point does not support this opinion. We regret still more that he should have suggested a comparison between the knowledge of our Lord and that of inspired men, and cited the passage in St. Mark xiii. 32 as having any connexion with the question of Inspiration (pp. 220, 221).

Nor do we like the language in which it is said, more than once, that 'the body to be bestowed at the resurrection' is not 'the same body that we possess now' (pp. 125-136). It is, of course, true that the bodies of the resurrection will be in a wholly different condition from that of bodies at the present time. They will be, in scholastic language, 'subtle,' 'agile,' 'glorious,' 'inherently immortal.' All this is plainly taught by St. Paul. But they will be the same bodies. Otherwise, the great parallel of the resurrection of Christians to the Resurrection of Christ would not hold good. It was the body in which He died with which He rose from the dead. So also with us:

we shall rise with the bodies we now possess, changed, made spiritual, filled with glory, but still the same bodies wherein we live on earth.

There are a few other passages we might criticise, and many we could quote with much appreciation. It may be sufficient to refer to the encouraging tone which pervades the volume and to quote the concluding passage :

'That therefore which is not "vain" or "void" is that which is full, rich in substance, pregnant with results. And such is the Christian "labour" to which St. Paul refers. To the eye of the world it may seem vain. These labour for the good of others who often neither think of them nor value them when known ; these self-denials and self-sacrifices to bring about, though it may be on a narrow field, a better time for the poor, the criminal, or the sorrowing ; these struggles in the distant recesses of the soul and in the private chamber to rise above the world, and to gain in larger measure the spirit of that heavenly and Divine Master Whom He follows, but of Whom he continually falls so far short ; these renouncings of earthly pleasures which He might enjoy, and of earthly riches and honours which he might gain—all these may seem to those around the believer the outcome of a fantastic imagination or of fevered dreams. Is it possible to say that they would be more than this were there no hereafter, were there nothing but the grave before us at the end of the thankless and not unfrequently disappointinging toil, were there no resurrection of the dead ? But they assume a new character in the light of the eternal world, and of the Resurrection of Him Who died for us and rose again that we, having partaken of His Spirit, may also share His glory. They are the labours of the seedtime, to be followed by an abundant harvest. They are the battle to be crowned with victory, the race to be ended at a glorious goal, the voyage over stormy seas that the ship may reach a smiling land, and may enter an eternal haven. Even while they are endured they are full of promise and of hope, and along with each is given a foretaste of the coming blessedness. The heart rises above everything that would otherwise weaken or discourage it. We may be counted fools for Christ's sake ; but in Him our weakness is strength, our tears are smiles, our sorrow is joy' (pp. 245-6).

*Scrivener's Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.*

Fourth Edition, edited by the Rev. EDWARD MILLER. 2 vols. (London : George Bell and Sons, 1894.)

It will be, perhaps, remembered that in our last number we reviewed at some length this new edition of the important book the title of which appears at the head of this Short Notice. We took occasion to draw attention to a number of mistakes and misprints, such as will, we fear, inevitably arise—human nature being what it is—in a work which abounds, as this does, with figures and minute details. Our list of *corrigenda* was taken mainly from the second volume ; but other reviews and private letters to the editor seem to have added a large number more. These have been printed now by Mr. Miller ; and for our own corrections, they seem to have been embodied almost complete. We say *almost* complete, for the *prima facie* contradiction as to the meaning of the term *Karkaphensian* remains on pp. 34, 36 ; and in regard to Macarius Magnus, Migne and Gallandius would hardly seem as likely to be correct as the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, which we do not think singles out a Macarius

*Magnus*. Similarly the correction of Mk. vi. 58 into vi. 53 in the note on p. 147 does not seem to have been made, or that suggested as to *τ*, on p. 53, and in vol. i. the correction of the French on p. 378 of the first volume. Mr. Miller may have, and doubtless has, good reason for these omissions. In the *corrigenda* as printed on p. 393 we notice that under MS. *Evan.* 472 *disposed* should be *disposed of*, and under *Evan.* 736 for *collated by* we should read *and collated*. We do not wish to run the risk of being thought ungracious or ungrateful, and therefore take the first opportunity of drawing the attention of our readers to the publication of these *corrigenda*, which have been printed in such a convenient form that they can be pasted in at the end of each volume. We have only to add that, as we learn from Mr. Miller's letters to the *Academy* and *Guardian*, all who have purchased this last edition can get the few pages of *corrigenda* gratis through their booksellers; and we advise all to make a point of doing this, so as to make what must always be a valuable book as complete as possible.

*The Church-Lessons Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Books of the Apocrypha, marked throughout as appointed to be Read in Churches.* (Oxford: printed at the University Press. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, Amen Corner, 1894. Royal 4to.)

Of all the plans which have been devised for marking the Lessons of the new Lectionary none, we believe, are of such practical simplicity and utility as that which the late Rev. T. Birkett applied some years ago to two pocket editions of the Bible, and which has now been extended, under the editorship of the Rev. Canon Buckle, to the Editions for the Reading Desk as embodied in the very handsome volume before us. The vice of all such systems is that the marks on the margin are more apt to be an embarrassment than a help to one who finds himself confronted with them for the first time. The publishers very justly say that 'if the following simple directions are remembered no error or uncertainty can occur.' Quite so; but to be remembered they must first be known. This, however, is a difficulty which cannot very often occur, and it can readily be met by a few words of caution to any stranger who is called on to read the Lesson to ignore the marks altogether.

*The Churchman's Oxford Kalendar for the Year of Our Lord God 1895, with Liturgical Colours for each day, Notes on the Seasons, Customs of the Church, Services, &c.* Edited by Dr. J. WICKHAM LEGG. (Oxford and London: Mowbray and Co.)

MESSRS. MOWBRAY are indeed to be congratulated on having secured the services of so distinguished a Liturgiologist as Dr. Wickham Legg as editor of their *Churchman's Kalendar* for the year 1895. It is full of most interesting information, which it is easy to see has been collected from original sources. As a rule we have a great distrust of the modern examples of Church Kalendars. The chief object of their compilers seems, in many cases, to have been to flout the Book of Common Prayer, and to indulge in the wild excesses of Roman-

izing ritual. No such charge can be laid against Dr. Wickham Legg. It is true that, so far as we have observed, the Prayer Book—that sheet-anchor of the Church of England—is only twice mentioned, viz. in the Note on the Sacraments Rubric and in a passage we are about to quote; but there is no hostile bias against it. On the contrary, we are pleased to note such words as these under the month of August:

‘In reciting the Divine Service the whole should be gone through as it is set out in the Prayer Book. . . . The Shortened Services Act was drawn up in forgetfulness of the Divine Service, and the permission offered to mutilate the Week Day should not be accepted. Above all, no shortening of the Service for the celebration of the Eucharist should be attempted. The Ten Commandments are a reminiscence of the ancient prophetic lesson, and they also retain the ancient Kyrie Eleison.’

Where did Dr. Wickham Legg discover that anciently ‘the Holy Eucharist was not celebrated on Good Friday or on Easter Even’? We venture to say that if he will look more closely into the matter he will find no small difficulty in substantiating this statement. That the Church of England intended there should be a celebration on Good Friday no dispassionate mind can reasonably doubt.<sup>1</sup>

An important feature in the edition of Mowbray’s *Kalendar* is the genuineness of the illustrations, by which we mean that they are no fancy pictures, but *bona fide* copies from Service Books of various kinds and dates. We have no doubt that Dr. Wickham Legg’s name will create a large demand for this *Kalendar*.

#### SOME S.P.C.K. PUBLICATIONS.

1. *As between Man and Man*: a Lancashire Picture. By CRONA TEMPLE. (London, no date.)
2. *Farmer Goldsworthy’s Will*. By MRS. ISLA SITWELL. (London, no date.)
3. *Dick Ralton’s Reconciliation*. By EDWARD N. HOARE, M.A. (London, no date.)
4. *Paul’s Partner*. By MARY RODING. (London, no date.)
5. *Hymns and their Stories*, with a Preface by EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Wells, and Prebendary of Wells Cathedral. By A. E. C. (London, 1894.)
6. *Spokes in the Wheel of Life*: Addresses to Young Men. By C. G. GRIFFINHOOF, M.A., late Senior Curate of St. Andrew’s, Wells Street. (London, 1894.)
7. *The Death of the Righteous: or How to Die Holy*. By the Rev. CLEMENT O. BLACKLOCK, M.A. (London, 1894.)
8. *Rest, Meditation, and Prayer*. By the Rev. HARRY JONES, M.A. (London, 1894.)
9. *Ecce Ancilla Domini: Mary, the Mother of our Lord*. Studies in the Christian Ideal of Womanhood. By ELIZABETH RUNDLE CHARLES. (London, 1894.)

<sup>1</sup> On this subject see a small pamphlet by W. A. Frost, Vicar Choral of St. Paul’s Cathedral, entitled *Good Friday and Easter Eve Communion, from the Days of the Apostles to the Present Time*.



10. *The Churchman's Manual: a Book of Instruction and Devotion.* By the Most Rev. ENOS NUTTALL, D.D., Bishop of Jamaica and Primate of the West Indies. (London, 1894.)
11. *The Old Churches of our Land: the Why, How, and When of them.* For those in search of a Hobby. By FRANCIS BALDWIN, Architect. (London, 1894.)
12. *The Catechism of the Orthodox Eastern Church.* By IGNATIUS MOSCHAKE. (London, 1894.)

WE have received a large parcel of books from the S.P.C.K., and are pleased to notice among them a greater number than usual of a kind more strictly in keeping with the title of the venerable Society.

Beginning with the stories, we are sorry to have to remark that they appear to us to be not only fewer in quantity but inferior in quality to those of former years.

(1) No fault, however, can be found with the first book upon our list, *As between Man and Man*, which is a really interesting and well-written story of life among the Lancashire cotton mills. The hero of the tale, Angelo Aspen, who, on account of his foreign name, is looked upon with suspicion by his mates, rescues a pretty north-country maiden from a storm, and finally marries her, after many misfortunes and adventures, which are vividly described. We are interested, too, in the large-minded vicar, who enters into Angelo's socialistic difficulties, and in the pathetic tale of the hard-working mill-hand who benefited thousands of his fellow-workmen by his invention of the 'weft-fork,' and yet came to a pauper's grave. We feel sure that this story will give pleasure to all classes of readers.

(2) *Farmer Goldsworthy's Will* is a fairly interesting tale, but we must own to being a little tired of the time-honoured device of the missing will, and we think it is quite incredible that a right-minded man, such as Farmer Goldsworthy is represented to be, could, under any circumstances, have been persuaded to draw up a will which made no provision for the son of his first wife.

(3) *Dick Ralton's Reconciliation* deals with the marvellous adventures of a runaway Irish lad in the Rockies. Dick himself is but a poor creature at best, and cannot be said to deserve the success which he finally attains, but there is perhaps a refreshing novelty in this reversal of the poetic justice which usually awaits the ne'er-do-weel in fiction.

(4) We are sorry to feel obliged to make a protest against *Paul's Partner*. This little tale is so well and pleasantly written that we were the more disappointed at finding an incident at the end which in our judgment renders the book quite unfit to be placed in the hands of children, for whom apparently the story is intended. 'The woman with a past' is unfortunately only too prominent in the popular literature of the day, but we might fairly expect to be safe from her in the pages of an S.P.C.K. story-book.

(5) The first of the graver books on our list is *Hymns and their Stories*, which has a very attractive preface by Prebendary Gibson.

The author's aim, as we are told in the Preface, is to 'tell in simple language the story of the growth of Christian hymnody, assigning, as far as possible, to their proper dates and authors those universal favourites which find a place in all the hymn books in common use.' We must confess, however, that the impression left upon our mind after perusing the book is, on the whole, one of disappointment. It seems to us that the author has attempted to compress too much information into too small a space, with the result that the hymns themselves do not stand out boldly enough to arrest the attention of the 'general reader,' for whom, rather than 'the student,' the book is said to be intended.

Indeed, we fear that 'the student' would find much that is inaccurate and slipshod in the information provided, and we should like, in a spirit of friendly criticism, to point out some of these errors which might be easily amended in a future edition.

On p. 21 we read 'The words of the latter hymn [the "Agnus Dei"] are also taken directly from the Bible—see St. John, i. 29; St. Matt. viii. 8.' We need hardly remark that the words of the last text, 'Lord, I am not worthy,' &c., do not form part of the 'Agnus Dei.'

Speaking of 'Antiphons' on p. 22, the writer says: 'They [the Reproaches] are still used in some of our churches in their prose form, and one metrical version has been made.'

It would have been more interesting to have added the information that this metrical version was made by the Rev. G. Moultrie, and that it is to be found slightly altered both in the *People's Hymn Book* and in the *Hymnary*. In speaking of the Advent Antiphons, no mention is made of the beautiful metrical versions by Dr. Neale, which originally appeared in *Hymns for Children* (3rd series), and are also to be found in the *Hymnary*. It would surely also have been better if A. E. C. had given the names of the Antiphons all in the original, or all in English, instead of attempting to translate some of them. In short, the treatment of these Antiphons is very feeble and inadequate.

On p. 54 we read of 'the translation (of the 'Veni, Creator') in the Ordination Service being most probably by Bishop Cosin'—no notice being taken of the older and longer translation which is also to be found in the Ordination Service.

We imagine that the next two errors which caught our eye are due to the printer; but it is rather surprising to read on p. 71 of 'the Office of Benedictus,' and on p. 72 we have a quotation from a hymn in the *Hymnary* (450), which would certainly not have been passed by the careful and accurate editors of that work.

'For our hearts are torn with anguish,  
All around are fear and woe;  
And the stoutest hearts are failing  
At the dread insidious foe,  
Spreading far and near contagion  
Lays the best and fairest low.'

A. E. C. tells us (on p. 99) that the hymn 'Great God ! what do I see and hear ?' was written in 1586, by Ringwaldt, a village pastor, who took the idea of it from the 'Dies Iræ.' We would refer our readers to p. 454 of Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*, where it is pointed out that this hymn has nothing in common with the 'Dies Iræ' except the subject. It seems that the first verse originally appeared anonymously in a book of *Psalms and Hymns*, published for public and private devotion at Sheffield in 1802, and the other verses were added and altered at various times and by various hands.

On p. 170 A. E. C. speaks of Thomas Whitehead's hymn (surely the correct spelling is Whytehead), 'Resting from His work to-day.' This hymn is only a cento from the original beautiful poem which begins 'Sabbath of the Saints of old—Day of Mysteries manifold,' and was intended for use on *all* Saturdays, not merely for Easter Eve. It is given in the *Hymnary* as a Saturday morning hymn, with six out of the entire number of nine verses.

It may be said that our remarks upon a book not intended for students are somewhat hypercritical, but we think that accuracy should be the first object in all books of instruction, and *Hymns and their Stories* appears to us more instructive and less popular in its design than we had expected from the title.

Before concluding we should like to draw attention to two remarks which are quite unworthy of the rest of the book. Speaking of the Venerable Bede (p. 78), A. E. C. says, 'He was called the father of English learning, but, *unlike so many very clever men*, he kept his faith in, and love of, God.' And on p. 175, 'Adelaide Proctor was a Roman Catholic, *but amongst her Legends and Lyrics* there is a very beautiful evening hymn.' It is not, surely, a matter of surprise that great intellects should be found among the saints, or that a member of another branch of the Church should be able to write a good hymn !

(6) *Spokes in the Wheel of Life* is the somewhat infelicitous title of a series of short addresses, originally delivered to the members of the Confraternity of Young Men in connexion with St. Andrew's, Wells Street, which have now been published in the hope 'that they might prove useful to a wider circle of English lads.' We see no reason why this hope should not be fulfilled, as the addresses are short and to the point, and contain much practical teaching. A good many quotations from the poets are scattered up and down the pages, some of which are assigned to their authors and some not. We notice that a well-known verse of Kingsley's has been altered to suit the audience—wisely, perhaps, as it would hardly have been judicious to address a guild of young men as 'sweet maids'—but it would have been better to confess to the alteration ; and we see no excuse for the inaccuracy in the second line—

'Be good, *my friends*, and let who will be clever ;  
Do noble things, *don't* dream them, all day long.'

'Do noble things, *not* dream them,' is, we believe, the right reading.

(7) The author of *The Death of the Righteous* tells us in his Preface that 'this simple little book is intended to be placed in the hands of such dying persons as have, at all events for some years, led an earnest Christian life.' It consists of an introductory chapter and seven others on the 'Seven Words from the Cross.' We feel sure that this will be a useful little book, although the style of the reflections does not commend itself to us personally; and we cannot help wondering whether we should not find it more irritating than consoling to be constantly addressed as 'dear dying friend,' and spoken of as 'the dying righteous'!

(8) Those who are familiar with the outside of the Rev. Harry Jones's church will remember that the busy passers by in Regent Street are daily invited to enter for 'Rest, Meditation, and Prayer.' Mr. Harry Jones speaks with much force of the necessity for times of 'Rest' in this toilsome and hurrying age. He says:

'In old times the want was met by religious festivals and "holy days," which brought holidays to all. . . . Modern Bank Holidays, though few, bear touching testimony to the need of "rest" felt by civilized people. The Church, however, was once more liberal than we are now, and the present arrangement is much as if a thief who had stolen a five-pound note gave you a sovereign back, and expected to be thanked for his consideration' (p. 19).

Mr. Harry Jones's view of 'Meditation' is not altogether the conventional one. He seems to consider it may be held to include, generally, a 'giving one's mind to,' or a 'taking the trouble to think over,' some question or thing. Some of his remarks on 'Prayer' are pithy and forcible, e.g.—

'Some, indeed, possess what is termed the "gift" of prayer. This may be a divine possession, though there are those in whose mouths it sounds like a gift of verbal fluency. We cannot hold the use of prayer in too profound honour and respect. We can, however, display a devotional facility, an air of easy confidence in speech to God, dangerously near to that use of His Name which men are warned against in the third Commandment, where we are forbidden to take it in vain' (p. 49).

And again:

'There is no virtue in mere repetition. The balance of God is not turned in our favour if only we keep on dropping one petition after another into the scale. Devotion cannot be mechanical; if it were, a praying machine would be invaluable' (p. 58).

(9) So many great writers have written so many good books in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mother that we almost wondered at Mrs. Rundle Charles's choice of subject. After having, however, read her *Ecce Ancilla Domini* we are bound to confess that it is a charming little book, pleasingly written, with some original thoughts gracefully expressed.

We should just like to know, by the way, why Mrs. Rundle Charles persists in calling the 'Magnificat' a 'matin-song' when the Church from the earliest ages has used it as a vesper hymn?

Besides an introductory chapter and twelve meditations on the

Life of the Blessed Virgin, the book contains two essays, 'Talitha Cumi,' a letter on 'True Girlhood,' and 'Women under the Jewish and Christian Religions,' which last was written at the request of the Chicago Women's Convention. The little book is daintily got up, and would be a thoroughly satisfactory present to a God-daughter or a Confirmation candidate among the educated classes.

(10) There is much that is both useful and excellent in this little *Churchman's Manual*, but we feel that we cannot conscientiously recommend it to our readers on account of its inadequate Eucharistic teaching. We will show what we mean by the following quotations :

'The bread and the wine, God's good gifts to us, are offered to Him to be blessed by Him, and given back to us as the signs and sacraments of better gifts still. . . .

'O God, all things are Thine, and from Thine hand have we received these fruits of the earth which we now offer to Thee. Accept them, O Lord, and bless them to us in this Holy Sacrament, that through them we may by faith receive the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . When this [the Consecration] is over, you must think of the bread and wine as holy things; for we do not receive them as common bread and wine, but as becoming to us spiritually (when we receive them by faith) the Body and Blood of Christ' (pp. 124, 128).

In the Catechism which forms the second part of the Manual the language about the Holy Eucharist is much more careful and orthodox, and this makes us hope that the Bishop may see his way to amending some of the expressions we have quoted, as we think they do not fairly represent his true views of the Blessed Sacrament. The Catechism is excellent throughout, if we except the question, 'Where are the Articles of the Christian Faith to be found, at large?' (p. 50), which suggests that the articles of the Creed are roaming about wildly in the Holy Scriptures.

(11) We have been amusing ourselves by comparing Mr. Baldwin's *The Old Churches of our Land* with what may be called its prototype, the admirable little *Handbook of English Ecclesiology*, published by the Ecclesiological Society in 1847. Great is the contrast between the severe simplicity and pictureless aspect of the earlier book, and the attractive garb of the later one, with an illustration on every page. But when it comes to reading the two books it seems to us that the contrast is all the other way, and that Mr. Baldwin's pages are dull and lifeless as compared with the varied information and brilliant style of the older writers. We have no doubt as to which book we should choose for a companion on an ecclesiological ramble—and this, not only because Mr. Baldwin's style is dull, which perhaps he cannot help, but because he has neglected to provide his book with an index, which makes it a most irksome task to discover which *Old Churches of our Land* he mentions, and what he says about them.

The older book has an Index of Churches and another of Subjects, besides being arranged in a way which makes it perfectly easy to ascertain the writer's opinions upon any particular point of ecclesiology.

The illustrations to Mr. Baldwin's book are quite charming, but

we do not see why the first ones should represent an imaginary ancient Church instead of a real one. On p. 84 he makes the unfounded assertion that 'the ancient stone altars of our old churches were universally destroyed by the Puritans in the sixteenth century.' This is certainly not true, as in many cases the altar slabs were merely removed and buried, or built into the pavement of the church. The *Handbook of English Ecclesiology* gives a list of more than twenty churches in which the altar-stones have been recognized, and no doubt many more have been discovered since 1847. In not a few churches at the present day the altar slabs have been restored to their original position. On p. 95 Mr. Baldwin says that 'in the case of York and Lincoln the title "minster" is a curious misnomer, neither of these cathedrals having ever been a monastery church.' As a matter of fact, we believe that from very early times the word 'minster' was used in England indifferently for collegiate and monastic foundations.

We wish to draw attention to a very curious error, which we should have put down to the printer if it did not occur twice in the book, once in the 'Table of Contents' and once on p. 142. We allude to the word 'Miserere,' which Mr. Baldwin writes thus, 'Misereré,' with an accent on the last letter.

(12) The publication of this little book ought to be of much use in emphasizing the points of unity between the Eastern Churches and our own. There is hardly a word in this 'Catechism' which could not be repeated by an English Churchman. Even the subject of Invocation of the Saints is soberly dealt with. 'We pray, and we rightly pray, properly speaking, to God alone. And if we pray also to the Saints and the Mother of God, we do this, not because we would make gods of them, but in order that we may use them as mediators with God, whose friends they became through their holy lives' (p. 37).

There is a strange misprint on p. 32. 'True repentance consists in recognizing evil, in being grieved on account of it, and *deading* it in holding steadfastly to what is good.' We cannot satisfactorily decide what the right word should be.



## INDEX TO VOL. XXXIX.

### ARN

**ARNOLD, MATTHEW**, the poetry of, 106 *sqq.*; the search for a new great poet, 107; present musicians in a minor key, 108; characteristics of Tennyson and Browning, 109; two estimates of Arnold, 111; Arnold's temperament, 112; moral intensity, 113; attitude towards philosophy and science, 114; his poetry a criticism of life, 115; its classic tone, 116; recognition of the pathos of life, 117; ethics of a humanized Stoicism, 118; the consolations of Nature, 120; contrasted with Wordsworth, 121  
*Aspects of Modern Study* (University Extension Addresses), 263  
 Austin, Mr. A., *The Garden that I love*, 550

**BASQUE LANGUAGE**, *The Earliest Translation of the Old Testament into* (a Fragment, ed. Ll. Thomas; *Anecdota Ozoniensia*), 548  
 Baldwin, Mr. F., *The Old Churches of our Land*, 565  
 Berger, M. S., *Histoire de la Vulgate*, &c., 223  
 Blacklock, Rev. C. O., *The Death of the Righteous*, 564  
 British Pelagian, a, 160 *sqq.*; Dr. Caspari's discovery of British Pelagian letters and sermons, 160; account of their contents, 161; an early expression of Christian socialism, 162; denunciation of evil teachers and vicious lives, 164; arguments in favour of celibacy, 165; the Pelagian distinction between the kingdom of heaven and eternal life, 166; the question of the date and authorship of the letters: *résumé* of Caspari's arguments,

### CRE

167; causes of their former ascription to the bishop and martyr Sixtus, 169; their date, 170; the author was Agricola, son of Severianus, 171; contents of the sermons, 172; estimate of Agricola and his creed, 172 *sq.*

**CHARLES**, Mrs. E. Rundle, *Ecce Ancilla Domini*, 564  
 Church Rev. C. M., *Chapters in the Early History of the Church of Wells*, 259  
*Church-Lessons Bible, The*, 559  
 Church Missions, the Science of, 4:6 *sqq.*; *Reports of the Boards of Missions*, 417; *Report of the Missionary Conference of May 1894*, 418; Dr. Cust's *Essay on the Prevailing Methods of the Evangelization of the Non-Christian World*, *ib.*; relations of Anglicans with Oriental Churches, 420; home administration of Missions, 423; the scientific study of Missions, 427; the missionary's vocation and training, 428; missionary colleges, 431; need of knowledge of non-Christian systems, 432; zeal of Mohammedans in their missionary work, 434; the question of caste in India, 436; undue introduction of Western habits, 437; educational missions, 439; 'Associate Missions', 440  
*Churchman's Oxford Kalendar for 1895* (ed. Dr. Wickham Legg), 559  
 Cooke, Rev. E. A., *Saint Columba*, 241  
 Creighton, Bishop (Peterborough), *A History of the Papacy*, &c. vol. v., 357 *sqq.*; the author's explanation of the German revolt (Luther's) against the Papacy,

## DAL

359; Luther's precursors, 361; the Reuchlin struggle, 363; *Epistola Obscurorum Virorum*, 364; beginning of Luther's attack: Indulgences, 366; Papal inappreciation of Luther, 368; growth of his antagonism, 369; political straits of Leo X. and his two immediate successors, 371; Charles V. Emperor, 372; character of Leo X., 374; grossly extravagant life of ecclesiastics in Rome, 375; a comparison between Raffaele and Luther, 376; Leo's successors, 377

**DALE**, Rev. R. W., *Christian Doctrine*, 442 *sqq.*; a scheme of systematic 'doctrinal sermons,' 442; the author's treatment of the Divinity of Christ, 444; the 'kenotic' theory, *ib.*; the limitations of our Lord's Manhood, 447; the 'Temptations of our Lord,' 449; Dr. Dale's way of regarding Holy Scripture, 451; his views of 'the Church as "the pillar and ground of the truth,"' 453; of General Councils, 454; the Atonement, *ib.*; 'belief' and 'knowledge' of the existence of God, 455

Didon, Rev. Father, *Belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ*, 534

Drage, Mr. G., *The Unemployed*, 269

Durandus, Bishop (Mende), *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Offices*, 242

**EGYPT**, recent works on, 474 *sqq.*; interest awakening on Egyptian Archæology, 474; reasons why we should be interested in Ancient Egypt, 476; review of Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization*, 477; origin of the Ancient Egyptians, 478; their religion, 480; magic and medicine, 481; the Sphinx, 483; power of the kings, 485; the Pyramids, 486; notice of Professor Erman's *Aegypten*, 487; the life of the people, 489; Professor Brugsch's *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 492;

## GLA

the sacred land of Punt, 495; Professor Petrie's *History of Ancient Egypt*, 497

**FAIRBAIRN**, Rev. Dr., *Religion in History and in Modern Life*, 553

*Fallen Angels* (Anon.), 539

Farrar, Archdeacon, *The Life of Christ as represented in Art*, 396 *sqq.*; work largely made up of quotations, 396; blunders, 397; Protestant bias, 399; diatribes, 400; the primitive art of the first Christians: development, 401; the letter of Lentulus, 404; Madonnas and Holy Families, 406; description of Karöly's work, *Raphael's Madonnas*, 407; Dr. Farrar's account of pictures of events in our Lord's life, 408; scenes of His Ministry, 410; the suffering Christ, 412; the Last Judgment, 414; 'Ideals of Christ in Art,' 415

**GLADSTONE**, Mr., on Heresy and Schism, and on the Atonement (articles in the *Nineteenth Century*), 76 *sqq.*; teaching of our Lord and His Apostles about the Church, 77; their attitude towards heresy and schism, 78; criticism of Mr. Gladstone's opinion that altered circumstances necessitate an altered attitude on the part of the Church, 79; the feeling which suggested Mr. Gladstone's article, 82; his contrast between 'genuine' and 'spurious' 'undenominationalism,' 83; doctrines which he calls 'only developments' are a part of the deposit of faith, 85; his view of the Church's loss of authority through the divisions of Christianity, 86.—On the Atonement: statement of his argument, 379; the consequences of sin, 381; consideration of fundamental truths which the doctrine presupposes, 382; answers to the argument that the Atonement is an act of injustice on the part of God, 385; the position occupied

## GRA

- by sacrifice in Holy Scripture, 389; the Church's teaching on the Atonement, 391; criticism of Mr. Gladstone's positions, 394
- Grane, Rev. W. L., *The Word and the Way*, 525
- Greek Papyri, 88 *sqq.*; recent discoveries of Greek documents in Egypt, 88; the Ἀθηναίων πόλις, 90; its intrinsic value, 92; the poems of Herodas, 93; Hyperides' orations, 96; fragments of Euripides' *Antiope*, *ib.*; papyri containing older copies of works already known to us, 98; the Petrie papyri, 100; Biblical fragments, 101; non-literary papyri: those giving records of Egypt, 102; benefits gained for the science of palæography, 105
- Griffithoofe, Rev. C. G., *Spokes in the Wheel of Life*, 563
- Gwatkin, Prof., *Selections from Early Christian Writers*, 236

**HARDY**, Mr. E. G., *Christianity and the Roman Government*, 528

Hatch, Rev. Dr., and Redpath, Mr., *A Concordance to the Septuagint, &c.*, Parts II. and III., 222

Hoare, Mr. E. N., *Dick Ralton's Reconciliation*, 561

Holland, Rev. Canon H. S., *God's City and the Coming of the Kingdom*, 255

*Homilies of Clement, Index to the*, 239

*Hymns and their Stories* (with Preface by Prebendary Gibson), 561

**JEBB**, Professor, *The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry* (Lectures delivered in the Johns Hopkins University), 265

Joceline, Elizabeth (1622), *The Mother's Legacy to her Unborn Child*, 254

Jones, Rev. Harry, *Rest, Meditation, and Prayer*, 564

**LIDDON**, Rev. Canon, *Clerical Life and Work*, 519

*Lombard Street in Lent*, Sermons by various clergymen, 231

## PRI

- London School Board election, 204 *sqq.*; Mr. Foster's position towards the religious question, 204; the Cowper-Temple clause, 206; how it has been carried out, 208; the causes of the recent discussions, 210; propositions of Mr. Diggle's party, 211; the circular to teachers, 212; their opposition, 213; Mr. Lyulph Stanley's views, 214; importance of the discussion, 215.—Note on the result of the election, 501 *sqq.*; misrepresentation and distortion of the real question at issue, 502; future position of the voluntary schools, 504; Report of the Archbishops' Committee appointed to consider the question, 505
- Lyttleton, Hon. and Rev. A. T., *College and University Sermons*, 251

**M'CLYMONT**, Rev. J. A., *The New Testament and its Writers*, 246

Miller, Rev. E., *Scrivener's Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 151, 558

Milligan, Rev. Dr., *The Resurrection of the Dead*, 556

Moberly, Rev. Canon, *Considerations upon Disestablishment and Disendowment*, 541

Moehler, Dr., *Symbolism, &c.* (tr. J. B. Robertson), 536

Moore, Dr. E., *Tutte le Opere di Dante Alighieri*, 515

Moschake, Ignatius, *The Catechism of the Orthodox Eastern Church*, 566

**NICHOLSON**, Rev. A., *Mr. Gladstone's Theology*, 524

Nuttall, Bishop (Jamaica), *The Churchman's Manual*, 565

**PLUNKET**, Lord (Archbishop of Dublin), Pamphlet and Letters on Church Reform in Spain and Portugal, 217

*Practical Reflections on every Verse of the Prophet Isaiah* (Anon.), 243

Primitive Church and the Papal

## PRI

Claims, the (review of Rev. L. Rivington's *Primitive Church and the See of Peter*), 1 *sqq.*; Mr. Rivington's thesis, 2; his assumptions, 4; was St. Peter bishop of Rome? 5; interpretation of a passage in Iræneus, 7; Tertullian's views, 9; St. Cyprian: his 'alleged appeals to Rome,' 11; the two Dionysiiuses, 12; the Popes' own 'witness to their office,' 13; Constantine and Melchiades, 14; the author's treatment of the Nicene Council, 15; alleged 'legates' of the Pope at the Council, 17; the sixth canon of Nicæa, 18; letter of Julius I. to the Arianizing Easterns, 19; the Sardican canons, 20; the lapse of Pope Liberius, 21; the Alexandrian Council of 362: St. Athanasius, 22; Mr. Rivington's treatment of St. Basil, 24; Gratian's rescript: meaning of *longinquituribus partibus*, 26; Councils of Constantinople, 27; value of Eastern expressions of respect for Rome, 29; St. Augustine and the Church of North Africa, 273; Innocent I.'s treatment of Pelagianism, 274; Mr. Rivington's defence of 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est,' 275; Zosimus and the *libellus* of Celestius, 276; Apiarius, 277; a Sardican canon treated as Nicene, 278; the African Church rejects Roman demands on the subject of appeals, 279; Nestorius: Celestine I., Cyril, and the Council of Ephesus, 281; the action of the bishops in the council, 286; Celestine's letter to them, 288; further samples of Mr. Rivington's method, 290; treatment of the Council of Chalcedon, 292; Leo's 'Tome,' 294; Marcian, Pulcheria, and Leo, 295; Leo's legates and the council, 296; the council's treatment of the 'Tome,' 298; its 'Definitio Fidei,' 300; Theodoret's case, 301; the twenty-eighth canon, 303; Tillemont's view, 304; Mr. Rivington's treatment, 305; the coun-

## ROO

cil's letter to Leo, 307; the Roman spirit pervading Mr. Rivington's work, 310; criticism of his *Reply to the Church Quarterly Review*: the alleged necessity of a visible head for the Church, 311; the Epistle of Clement, 312; the 'Roman Episcopate of St. Peter,' 313; Pope Sylvester and Nicæa, 315; the views of St. Cyprian, 316; St. Basil and Eustathius, 318; Julian's I.'s letter to the Eusebians, 319; the technical meaning of *directi*, 321  
 Prynne, Rev. G. R., *The Truth and Reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, &c., 227  
 Pusey, Dr. (review of vol. iii. of Canon Liddon's *Life*), 336 *sqq.*; the large scale on which the work is written, 336; peculiar points in Pusey's character, 338; his relations with Bishop Wilberforce, 340; Pusey's suspension, 343; his 'tone towards Rome,' 344; his relations with Keble as his confessor: ascetic practices, 348; relations with Dr. Hook and St. Saviour's, Leeds, 350; foundation of Sisterhoods, 351; the Gorham controversy, 352; question of the Royal Supremacy, 354; University life, 355; doctrine of the Real Presence, 356

RAF, Mr. J., *Eight Hours for Work*, 267

Reed, Rev. J. S., *The Bishops' Blue Book*, 238

*Reports of the Boards of Missions . . . on the Mission Field*, 271, 417

Robertson, Rev. A., *St. Athanasius on the Incarnation*, 235

Roding, Mary, *Paul's Partner*, 561

Roof of Asia, the, 55 *sqq.*; Tibet: the Great Table-land, 56; travels of the Pundit Nain Singh, 57; geography of Western Tibet, 58; Mustagh Pass: gigantic glaciers, 59; Nushik Pass, 60; Mr. Conway's exploration of the Karakoram Himalayas, 61; Gilgit and Kanjut valleys, 62; Hispar Pass: a mud avalanche, 63;

## SAN

Baltoro glacier, 64; shrunken remnants of glaciers, 65; Shigar valley, 66; Lord Dunmore's travels: Valley of Kashmir, 67; dried up Tibetan lakes, 68; glacier-defile of Sassar, 69; the district named by Lord Dunmore 'The Roof of Asia,' 70; the Pamirs of the Upper Oxus, 72; Captain Bower and Dr. Thorold's journey through Tibet, 73; Tibetan nomads, *ib.*; Lamas hostile to English, 74; description of the great central plateau (Chang Tang), 75; the future of Tibet, 76

**SANTA TERESA** (Mrs. Cunningham Graham's work), 30 *sqq.*; the author's position towards Christianity, 32; state of Spain at the time of Teresa's birth, 33; Avila, 35; her lineage, *ib.*; early years, 36; becomes a Carmelite nun, 37; a grievous illness, 38; spiritual growth, 39; her revelations, 40; her mysticism, 43; Mrs. Graham's criticism of her writings, 44; the reform of the Carmelite Order, 46 *sqq.*; initial difficulties, 47; a picture of convent life before the reform, 48; principles of her reform, 49; her first foundations, 50; a wider field of action, 53; her last years and death, 53 *sqq.*; estimate of her greatness, 55

Scholler, Mr. L. W., *A Chapter of Church History from South Germany*, 532

Seeley, Rev. E., *The Great Reconciliation and the Reign of Grace*, 538

Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. xi.: Sulpitius Severus; Vincent of Lérins; John Cassian, 507

Shuckburgh, Mr. E. S., *A History of Rome to the Battle of Actium*, 530

Sinaitic Palimpsest of the Four Gospels in Syriac (text, ed. Prof. Bensly, J. R. Harris, and F. C. Burkitt), 512; translation, by Mrs. A. S. Lewis, *ib.*

## TEX

Sitwell, Mrs. Isla, *Farmer Goldsworthy's Will*, 561

Smith, Dr. Goldwin, *Oxford and her Colleges*, 544

Smith, Rev. Canon R. Travers, *Lessons on Thought and Prayer*, 526

St. Clement's Epistle and the early Roman Church, 174 *sqq.*; the first Christian community in Rome, 175; a floating Christian element there, 176; St. Paul a prisoner there, 177; St. Peter's connexion with the Roman Church, 178; the period of persecution, 179; St. Peter's first Epistle, 180; its date, 181; Domitian's persecution, 182; directed especially against individuals of mark and prominence, 183; state of the Corinthian Christians whom St. Clement addressed, 184; contrast of the letter with later utterances of the Roman See, 185; the virtues the writer praises and the sins he blames, 186; the moral ascendancy of the early Roman Church, 187; Clement's letter for a long time forgotten, *ib.*; account of the imperfect Alexandrine MS. of it, 188; Bryennios' edition of the complete text, 189; a Syrian version found, *ib.*; Dom Morin's discovery of a Latin version, 190; collation of passages in the four, 191; history of the Latin version, 195; its date, 196; period when Latin took the place of Greek in the Christian Church, 198; instances of early Latin translations, 202

Stead, Mr. W. T., *If Christ came to Chicago!* 253

Stirling, Mr., *The Protestant Prayer Book*, &c., 261

Swete, Rev. Dr., *The Apostles' Creed*, 247

**TEMPLE, CRONA**, *As between Man and Man*, 561

Textual criticism of the New Testament, 137 *sqq.*; account of Dr. Scrivener's *Introduction* and of Dr. Ezra Abbott and Dr.

## THE

Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's New Testament, 137; Dr. Gregory's work in the latter, 138; his account of the different forms of the Syriac version, 140; the MSS. of the various classes, 141; the Bohairic (Memphitic), Ethiopic, and Armenian versions, 142; the Georgian, 143; Persian and Arabic, 144; Western versions, 145; errors in Dr. Gregory's list of MSS., 146; patristic quotations from the New Testament, 148; *corrigenda* and *addenda* suggested for Dr. Gregory's work, 150; Mr. Miller's edition of Scrivener's *Introduction*, 151; defects and errors pointed out, 152 (see also *post*, 558); good points in Mr. Miller's work, 157; the account of the versions, 158

*The Gentleman's Magazine Library: Ecclesiology* (ed. F. A. Milne), 257

Thomson, Mr. H. M., *The Nicene Creed Catechetically Explained*, 234

UPTON, Professor, *Hibbert Lectures: on the Bases of Religious Belief*, 322 *sqq.*; interesting features: arguments for the being of God, 323; a theory of the immanence of God, 327; place of conscience in human thought, 328; the doctrine that man was made in 'the image of God,' 330; Prof. Upton's description of the complete conception of Religion, 332; his view of the Divinity of Christ, criticized, 332 *sqq.*

VAUGHAN, Mr. R. A., *Hours with the Mystics*, 244  
'*Verba Verbi Dei*' (Anon.), 239  
*Vita et Doctrina Iesu Christi ex*

## YOU

*IV Evangelistis collecta, &c.* (re-cension of Avancini), 263

WANKLYN, Rev. J. H., *The Lessons of Holy Scripture illustrated by Thoughts in Verse*, 250

*Waymarks in Church History* (review of Dr. Bright's work), 122 *sqq.*; the qualities required in a historian, 123; Dr. Bright's severe criticism of some episodes of Cyril of Alexandria's career: Hypatia, 124; the danger of whitewashing the faults of men prominent as Christians, 126; the study of Church History, 127; Cyril and Nestorius, 128; the title *Theotokos*, 'Mother of God,' bestowed on St. Mary, 129; Dr. Bright's views on its use, 131; on the origin of the Church of England, 132; the newspaper correspondence about the essay on 'Papalism and Antiquity,' 134; criticism of Mr. Rivington's rejoinder, 134 *sqq.*

White, Rev. D. J., *What is Worship?* 527

Wordsworth, Bishop (Salisbury), *Novum Testamentum... Latine, &c.*, Part. I. Fasc. III., 223

Wynne, Bishop (Killaloe and Clonfert), *Our Confirmation Class*, 250

YOUNGER POETS, the, 457 *sqq.*; continued search for a great poet, 458; poetic merits of some minor poets: Mr. Watson, 459; conspicuous qualities of his poetry, 460; his failings, 461; his elegy on Lord Tennyson, 463; his later compared with his earlier work, 465; the work of Mr. John Davidson, 467; *Fleet Street Eclogues*, 468; his special characteristics, 469; work of Mr. Francis Thompson, 471; its good points and weaknesses, 472



&c. (re-  
3

H., *The  
Scripture  
in Verse,*

*tory* (re-  
ork), 122  
quired in  
Bright's  
episodes  
career:  
anger of  
of men  
ns, 126;  
ory, 127;  
28; the  
of God,  
129; Dr.  
se, 131;  
church of  
aper cor-  
essay on  
ty,' 134;  
ton's re-

*is Wor-*

alisbury),  
. *Latine,*  
223  
nd Clon-  
*Class*, 250

the, 457  
rch for a  
merits of  
Watson,  
ies of his  
gs, 461;  
son, 463;  
his earlier  
Mr. John  
*street Ec-*  
l charac-  
Mr. Fran-  
its good  
472